GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,

SEPTEMBER 26, 2006

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing convened in Room 220 South, 441 4^{th} Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, pursuant to notice at 9:30 a.m., Geoffrey H. Griffis, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

GEOFFREY H. GRIFFIS Chairperson
RUTHANNE G. MILLER Vice-Chairperson
CURTIS ETHERLY, JR. Board Member
JOHN A. MANN, II Board Member (NCPC)

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

MICHAEL TURNBULL Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY

Secretary (BZA)

BEVERLY BAILEY

Sr. Zoning Specialist

JOHN NYARKU

Zoning Specialist

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:

SHERRY GLAZER, ESQ.

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

MATT JESICK STEPHEN MORDFIN

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

This transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on September 26, 2006.

NEAL R. GROSS

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2

3 4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9:51 a.m.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Let me call to order the 26th of September 2006 Public Hearing of the Board of Zoning Adjustment of the District of Columbia. My name is Geoff Griffis, Chairperson. Joining me today is Ms. Miller, Vice Chair, and representing the National Capital Planning Commission with us is Mr. representing the Zoning Commission with us this morning is Mr. Turnbull.

Mr. Etherly our other esteemed colleague and Board Member will be joining us shortly. He has been a little bit delayed out on the road. However, we're going to proceed with our agenda this morning and he will step in as and when he arrives.

Copies of today's hearing agenda available for you. They are located at the table where you entered into the hearing room. You can pick it up and figure out where you are on the chronology. We will be calling the cases in order of their publication on that schedule. It is very important that you know a couple of things. In my opening remarks, I'm going to go very quickly, so if there are questions, of course, you can just raise your hand and I will clarify.

However, it should be noted that all proceedings before the Board of Zoning Adjustment are recorded. They are recorded in two fashions. The most exciting, of course, is the Court Reporter, who is sitting on our floor to the right, creating the official transcript. We are also being broadcast on the Office of Zoning's website.

Attendant to both of those, there are several things that we ask. First, before coming forward to speak to the Board, I would ask that you fill out two witness cards. Witness cards should be available for you at the table close to the door. They are also available where you will provide your testimony. Two cards go to the recorder prior to coming forward to speak to the Board.

When that is done and you are ready to address the Board in your case, you can come forward, have a seat at the table, make yourself comfortable. You will need to state your name and address once for the record, obviously, then we can give you all credit on the transcript for that important information that you will provide the Board.

The order of procedure for special exceptions and variances is as follows: First, we

NEAL R. GROSS

will hear from the applicant. Second, we will hear any Government reports attendant to the application. Third, we will hear from the ANC within which the property is located. Fourth, we will hear persons or parties in support of an application. Fifth would be persons or parties in opposition to the application. And, sixth, finally, we will return to the applicant for any additional testimony, rebuttal testimony and/or closing remarks or summations.

Cross examination is permitted by the applicant, parties and the ANC. I will go through specific instruction on cross examination, if it warrants during a specific application.

The Sunshine Act requires that we hold all our hearings in the open and before the public. Our rules and regulations allow us to enter into Executive Session for deliberating and/or just reviewing records on cases and we do that once in a while and it is in accordance with the Sunshine Act.

However, the decision of the Board must be based exclusively on the public record that is created before us today. So attendant to that, we ask two things. First, that you make sure that all the information that you think is germane and important for the record be put into the record, either orally

NEAL R. GROSS

in your testimony or in writing, and secondly, we ask that during recesses, breaks or at any time during our hearings that you do not engage Board Members in private conversation. This would, of course, give the appearance of receiving information outside of the public record.

With that, those are my instructions and I

With that, those are my instructions and I want to say a very good morning to Ms. Bailey on my very far left, Ms. Glazer with the Office of the Attorney General is with us, Mr. Moy with the Office of Zoning is also with us in and out. I would ask, Ms. Bailey, if you are aware of any preliminary matters for the Board's attention this morning?

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board and to everyone, good morning.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good morning.

MS. BAILEY: There is, Mr. Chairman, and I just wanted to make sure the record reflects that Application No. 17460 of GKD 1412 Chapin Street, N.W. -- I'm sorry, 1412 Chapin Street, LLC, that application was withdrawn, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank you. Then there is no Board action required on that.

MS. BAILEY: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: We appreciate that.

NEAL R. GROSS

Very well. Are there any other preliminary matters that you are aware of?

MS. BAILEY: Other than swearing in the

witnesses, Mr. Chairman, that's it.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Let me ask if anyone here is present that has preliminary matters for the Board's attention? Preliminary matters are those which relate to whether a case will or should proceed today, if proper notice or for any reason you don't believe an application on our schedule should not proceed, you can come forward and let us know. Not noting any indication of any preliminary matters, I'm going to ask for all those that are going to address the Board this morning if you would, please, stand and give your attention to Ms. Bailey. She is going to swear you in.

(Whereupon, the witnesses were sworn.)

MS. BAILEY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank you all very much. With that then, let's call the first case.

MS. BAILEY: Application No. 17516 of Jeffrey Sneider, pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1, for a special exception to allow a rear addition to an existing single-family row dwelling under section 223,

NEAL R. GROSS

not meeting the lot occupancy requirements, that's section 403. The property is Zoned R-3 and it's located at 3265 N Street, N.W., Square 1230, Lot 821. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good morning. MR. HORSEY: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. My name is Outerbridge Horsey. My address is 1228 1/2 31st Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007. I'm here representing Jeffrey Sneider, the owner of 3265 N Street. Mr. Sneider is in the audience to my left. We are here to request the Board's review and approval of a 6 percent variance for the lot occupancy for a row house in historic Georgetown. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. And I must say the record is entirely full on this, but let me just ask you a couple of quick questions. MR. HORSEY: Sure. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Is it your understanding the Office of Planning is also recommending approval? MR. HORSEY: Yes. I got that notice yesterday.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: This has also been through Georgetown Historic Board, the old Georgetown Board and also was approved?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. HORSEY: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And is there any opposition that you are aware of on this?

MR. HORSEY: No.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Any concerns in your discussing with the area regarding the 223 requirements for this addition?

MR. HORSEY: No. We discussed it with both neighbors, with three neighbors that are affected. Two of them have written letters in support of the special exception. The third one gave his initial approval, but we did not find a letter.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Noting letter of support, Exhibit 25, 21 and also 20. Is there anything that has arose in your workings of this that led you to believe that this would somehow impair the light, air or privacy and use of the adjacent properties?

MR. HORSEY: The only person affected is the -- this is an apartment building on the corner, similar in construction to my client's building. The only window that's really affected is this one back in here and it serves on -- it serves a bathroom at the back of this unit and this particular property owner has referred to this. I'm sorry. It's this small

NEAL R. GROSS

1 window that's impacted by the addition. This large 2 building isn't really impacted. GRIFFIS: 3 CHAIRPERSON Well, is your 4 testimony that it would or would not unduly compromise 5 the use? MR. HORSEY: Not unduly, no, no, no. 6 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Anything else 8 would like to summarize for in this you us 9 application? MR. HORSEY: I think that's it. 10 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. 11 MR. HORSEY: That's all. 12 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you very much. 13 Let's move on to the Office of Planning then. A very 14 15 good morning to you. An excellent report. appreciate it. If there is anything you would like to 16 summarize or take the whole time you would like or you 17 can stand on the record. 18 19 MR. MORDFIN: Good morning, Chair Members of the Board. I'm Stephen Mordfin with the 20 21 Office of Planning and the Office of Planning stands on the record. 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. 23 Thank 24 you very much. Again, an excellent report. We do 25 It's very thorough in its analysis. appreciate it.

Mr. Horsey, do you have any cross examination of the Office of Planning?

MR. HORSEY: I do not, sir.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Any questions from the Board of the Office of Planning? I would note again, of course, that it is Exhibit No. 23 and they are recommending approval of this application. Let's move ahead then. We have noted as opening and also in the record that the Georgetown Board had reviewed and approved this. Is the ANC-2E present? Is a member of the ANC present? Not noting any member, we note Exhibit 22, it's September 5, 2006. The ANC-2E voted not to object to the application.

Ι don't have other attendant any Government reports to this application, unless the applicant is aware of any others or Board Members are aware of any others. Very well. Let's move ahead then to any persons present in Application 17516 in support of the application to provide testimony. Is here to provide testimony? Persons in opposition to 17516?

Very well. Not noting, I'll turn it over to you for any closing remarks you might have.

MR. HORSEY: No, I thank you for your review and look forward to your decision.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank you very much. I think this record, as I started out, is very full and it's appropriate to stand on the record, which we have actually kind of forced you into. But I have noted that and unless the Board has additional questions of the applicant, we could take those now. Any questions, clarifications?

It's very clear on what's happening here and I think this is without taking a lot of time my normal stump speech of the importance and the critical aspect of section 223 of the Zoning Regulations. This obviously fits straight into it. And running through and I think we can rely substantially on the submissions by the applicant, but also on the Office of Planning's analysis, which breaks out the 223 requirements, which we have orally touched on and also in the written submission.

I would move approval of Application 17516 for a special exception allowing the rear addition to the existing single-family row dwelling not meeting the lot occupancy requirements at 3265 N Street, N.W., and ask for a second.

BOARD MEMBER MANN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you very much,
Mr. Mann. I appreciate it. Again, I don't think I

NEAL R. GROSS

need to walk through the entire piece of this. However, there has been no evidence that has arisen to the fact that this would unduly impair the use and privacy, certainly, the light and air to the adjacent properties. It's actually interesting. If we really were to spend more time on it, an interesting kind of lot scenario and the addition.

I don't think it serves us well to take a lot of time getting into it, but I think one of the requirements, of course, of 223 is to properly represent through graphic representation and drawings what is being proposed and what is existing. And this does it very well. Enough to the fact that I don't think we actually need to get much into further questioning.

I'll open it up for others for deliberation, comments. Very well. If there's no other further comments to this, we do have a motion before us. It has been seconded. I would ask for all those in favor to signify by saying aye.

ALL: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And opposed?

Abstaining? Very well. Ms. Bailey, why don't we record the vote?

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, the vote is 4-

NEAL R. GROSS

0-1 to approve the application. Mr. Griffis made the 2 motion, Mr. Mann second, Mrs. Miller, Mr. Turnbull 3 supports the motion and Board Member Etherly is not present at this time. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. I don't see any reason why we wouldn't waive our rules and 6 regulations and issue a summary order on this, unless 8 there is any objection from the Board Members or the Not noting any objections, why don't we 9 applicant. 10 issue a summary order? 11 MS. BAILEY: Thank you, sir. 12 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you very much. Mr. Horsey, thank you very much. 13 MR. HORSEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 14 15 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have a pleasant day. MR. HORSEY: Members of the Board. 16 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And good luck. 17 MR. HORSEY: Thank you. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Why don't we move ahead? 20 BAILEY: Application No. 21 MS. 17515 of Abdul Kamara, pursuant to 11 DCMR 3104.1, 22 for a 23 special exception to construct a four unit apartment building under section 353. The property is Zoned R-24 25 5-A and it's located at 5031 B Street, S.E., Square

5325, Lot 10. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good morning. Ιf you wouldn't mind turning your microphone on. 3 Just touch the button there. Perfect. 4 MR. AGBIM: All right. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And just state your 6 name and address for the record, please. 8 MR. AGBIM: My name is Ike Agbim, 9 Mercantile Lane, Largo, Maryland 20774. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. 10 And you're the architect representing the applicant in 11 12 this? MR. AGBIM: 13 Yes. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. And we 14 15 have revised drawings, is that correct, September 20? MR. AGBIM: Yes, sir. 16 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. I'll turn it 17 over to you for openings. 18 19 MR. AGBIM: Okay. Thank you very much, This project is for a single 20 Board and public. 21 building and a vacant lot. It's Zoned R-5-A currently and it's on the 5000 Block of B Street, S.E. 22 The 23 proposal is for a four unit for sale condominium building that will be articulated on this project 24

This block, the block that this building is

site.

proposing is predominantly apartments. As a matter of fact, all the buildings on that same side of the street are apartment buildings, except one, which is the building next door, which is a single-family building.

The proposal is for four units, like I said earlier, with four parking spaces and the project meets all requirements of Title IV. The requirement is for, you know, this special exception, since this is an R-5-A Zone to show that there is a consistence in the project design with the existing or majority of the existing buildings in the block. And through the architectural design of this project, we have physically designed a building to be consistent with the buildings on the same block, on the same side of the street.

We were hoping that if this application is approved, that this will benefit and contribute to the District's Plan, Comprehensive Plan for Ward 7, which is mainly a provision of affordable housing as well as home ownership opportunities for medium income people. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank you very much. 353, which you are under, of course, is a special exception and it refers us, however, to

NEAL R. GROSS

the requirements of 410 in the regulations. So let me just walk through a couple of questions with you.

MR. AGBIM: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And, you know, it's interesting because the regulations are written as if in this R-5 Zone you are building multiple buildings. So some of these don't really make a lot of sense, but am I correct that your buildings and the group of buildings should be erected simultaneously, that would be moot. Front entrances abut the street, front yard or front porch. Is that correct?

MR. AGBIM: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: All right. Yes, I don't really see a lot of these that we need to spend time on.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes, I don't see either.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. I noted the revised drawing. Why don't we walk through a little bit. I know Office of Planning is going to talk probably a little bit more about this, but in terms of the particular attention to the landscaping and how this building sets in, do you want to just walk us through what you are proposing? Do you have a curb cut and a drive aisle up to the four parking spaces?

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. AGBIM: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: In back.

MR. AGBIM: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And then you have a small side yard?

MR. AGBIM: Right. This project has one curb cut to provide the required parking spaces in the rear of the project, which is four, one for each of the four units of the building. And what we have done is we have articulated the building to maintain statutory side yard requirements. We have 9 foot side yard on both sides of the project.

Now, because the side slopes rapidly to the southeast corner, we have had to use a retaining wall to prevent water runoff from this project site to the next property at 5043 B Street, which is a much lower ground. So that retaining wall gives us an opportunity to gradually take care of the water on the site through an area drain in the parking lot and through a minor slope to swales that go through the right side of the building. That area we have landscaped adequately to make sure there is no erosion problems in that area.

There is also a trash enclosure that's sort of hidden inside the landscaping on the right

NEAL R. GROSS

1	side of the building.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Which side is the
3	trash enclosure? Oh, I see. It's on the side yard.
4	MR. AGBIM: It's on the west side, right.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. And so how
6	does that function?
7	MR. AGBIM: The trash?
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, the trash
9	trucks pull off on the at the curb?
10	MR. AGBIM: Well, usually what happens in
11	this situation for a small building, the trash truck,
12	small trash collecting truck pulls up and they walk up
13	to it, open the gates and pull the bags of trash out
14	and then load it onto the truck and drive away.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I see. Okay. Okay.
16	Okay. Any other questions?
17	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I have questions.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, go ahead.
19	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I think that you said
20	that this building was going to be consistent with the
21	other buildings on the street, on that side of the
22	street and I'm wondering, is there something across
23	the street?
24	MR. AGBIM: Well, across the street is
25	mostly vacant lot. There are, however, two single-

family dwellings on opposite side of the street and those -- but there are a total of three single-family dwellings in this block all along B Street between 50 and 51st. The rest of the buildings there are apartment buildings, 12 units, 9 units, 16 units and so on and so forth.

So what I meant to say was the majority. The majority of the buildings on the block are, you know, brick, cube-style apartment buildings.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: And you also mentioned that these were going to be affordable units. And how do we know that they are going to be affordable units?

MR. AGBIM: Well, the current pricing that we have for those units, you mean as they are sold, between now and May of next year will meet -- will make it easy for any person in 60 to 80 percent of the median, average median income for the area to afford. So that's a price range of between \$175 to \$200,000 for the two bedroom units.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: So that's the price you're setting it at.

MR. AGBIM: Yes, ma'am.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: But how do we know that won't go higher if there was a demand for it or is there not in that area?

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. AGBIM: Generally, the market forces stay the same, which one can easily project for next six months. We are very confident that the project can be delivered at that level.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. And I think there was a question about the retaining wall with Office of Planning.

MR. AGBIM: Right, right.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: And so you have decreased it in height. Is that correct?

MR. AGBIM: Yes, yes. We did a lot of articulation and initially the concern was the height of the wall above the neighbor's property. worked the grade in the area to maintain positive drainage out of the site into an area drain, but at the same time lowered the wall down, so that the impact of the wall wouldn't be felt as much. In addition, we changed the finish of that wall, so that the wall can be constructed of split face split architecture, face blocks, which more pleasing to the eye than a big concrete wall.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. And why is the height -- you have it at 4 feet now?

MR. AGBIM: It's at 4 feet at the highest point.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay.
2	MR. AGBIM: And the highest point is
3	basically on the southeast corner for about 10 feet.
4	VICE CHAIR MILLER: And what's the rest of
5	it?
6	MR. AGBIM: The rest of it tapers down.
7	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Gradually?
8	MR. AGBIM: Right. Tapers down to 3 feet
9	and so on.
10	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you.
11	MR. AGBIM: All right.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, Mr. Turnbull?
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman,
14	thank you. I just want to get back to the trash
15	route, the trash enclosure. You said they pull out
16	the bags, but there is a receptacle in there? Is
17	there a metal box?
18	MR. AGBIM: What it is is a 4 foot high
19	fenced area that will contain, would house individual
20	trash containers, one for each unit. And what happens
21	is that enclosure has a gate and when the gate gets
22	opened up, the trash collection person can pull the
23	trash from those bins and put in the truck.
24	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So they don't

wheel out?

1	MR. AGBIM: They can actually wheel it.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
3	MR. AGBIM: We have provided pavers in
4	front to soften the landscape in the area as well as
5	provide some hardscaping.
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: How high is the
7	enclosure again?
8	MR. AGBIM: It's I believe 4 feet.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It looks it says 3
10	feet here, but I'm not I can't read it.
11	MR. AGBIM: Right, right.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It looks like on
13	the plan, the landscape plan it shows 3 feet. What
14	kind of an enclosure is that? Is that a wooden fence?
15	MR. AGBIM: It's a metal enclosure with a
16	metal grated floor. The floor is actually grated, so
17	that it doesn't preclude any landscaping below. Below
18	that enclosure, we're going to have gravel to finish
19	off that area.
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So is that only a
21	cyclone fence then around it?
22	MR. AGBIM: Right. It's just a fence, no
23	roof or anything.
24	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Are there any
25	other kinds of is there an air conditioning pad or

1	anything out here? I don't see anything indicated
2	mechanically.
3	MR. AGBIM: Yes, the air conditioning
4	parts will be on the roof, sir.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: They are on the
6	roof?
7	MR. AGBIM: Right.
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. What about
9	lighting in the parking lot?
10	MR. AGBIM: Well, what we have done
11	basically, it's not shown on any plans, but through
12	positioning lights on the building, we feel that we
13	can provide sufficient lighting for the rear and the
14	sides and also the front.
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: There is lights on
16	the back of the building?
17	MR. AGBIM: Yes. However, that's not
18	currently shown on the we only show the lighting in
19	the front right now, but the intention is to have
20	lighting on all sides of the building to shed light on
21	the parking lot and the side yards.
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I mean, are you
23	are these mounted high on the building? Are you
24	flooding the parking lot?
25	MR. AGBIM: Right. They are just going to

be lighting specifically for the parking areas. 2 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, Ι think, I might have a little problem. 3 I think there might be some issues with flooding the parking lot. think, especially, for the neighbors it might be a concern. 6 Understood. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Sure. 8 Have you picked the light fixtures yet? 9 MR. AGBIM: No. 10 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. 11 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, Ι think 12 something a little bit more sensitive. But we can let you select the 13 MR. AGBIM: light fixtures that will not be a problem, will not be 14 -- affect the neighbors adversely. 15 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: How high does the 16 17 mechanical -there is nothing showing elevations that show the mechanical on the roof. 18 19 high do they stick up or how big are these? MR. AGBIM: Yes, they are probably about 20 2.5 feet high. 21 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. 22 MR. 23 AGBIM: So from the ground perspective, they will probably not be seen from --24 25 somebody walking on the street wouldn't be able to see

1	them.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So there is four
3	of them, one for each unit?
4	MR. AGBIM: Right.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I guess my
6	big thing right now is on the lighting. We addressed
7	that.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you. Other
11	questions?
12	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Could you just clarify
13	for me what does the parking back up to? What is
14	behind the parking?
15	MR. AGBIM: On the west side?
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And the rear. Is
17	there any alley in the rear?
18	VICE CHAIR MILLER: In the right, right.
19	MR. AGBIM: No, there is no alley.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. So it abuts
21	the adjacent single-family home?
22	MR. AGBIM: There is another lot. Right.
23	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you.
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Here. See the file
25	shows this. It might be better than anything we have.

1	VICE CHAIR MILLER: We got that.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, but you can't
3	see it. It's black and white. Those are color.
4	We'll pass it on down. Okay. Any other questions at
5	this point? Let me ask you, is there a grade change
6	in those pavers going up to the trash enclosure area?
7	MR. AGBIM: Is there a what?
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Is there a grade
9	change? Does it slope a little bit?
10	MR. AGBIM: Very minimal.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: It does.
12	MR. AGBIM: Right.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And the area
14	of enclosure, what's the surface? Are you treating
15	the surface at all?
16	MR. AGBIM: Well, like I mentioned, the
17	area, the fence sits on posts and the fence is the
18	enclosure, it has a grated floor.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, it has a what
20	MR. AGBIM: It is raised.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: kind of floor?
22	MR. AGBIM: It's grated. It's a grate.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
24	MR. AGBIM: It's a metal grate. It's a
25	metal grate. The floor is metal grate.

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, I see.
2	MR. AGBIM: And that floor is raised off
3	the ground by about 9 inches.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Why do you do that?
5	MR. AGBIM: Well, the usually in these
6	areas sometimes there is problem of pests.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Uh-huh.
8	MR. AGBIM: And this is one of the ways
9	that that problem can be addressed. When you raise it
10	off the floor, it gives an opportunity it's easier
11	to clean. And because it's a grate, it's a removable
12	grate
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Sure.
14	MR. AGBIM: that can be removed,
15	cleaned and replaced. That sits on metal angles all
16	around the enclosure.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Interesting.
18	MR. AGBIM: Right.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Would it be
20	the same if you just poured a pad, concrete pad? You
21	could hose that down.
22	MR. AGBIM: Right. That can be hosed
23	down, too, right.
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And did you
25	think about that?

1	MR. AGBIM: Well, when we do it, a pad can
2	be used, but the enclosure, the walls of the enclosure
3	can then be raised off the pad to provide that
4	ventilation. But, you know, these are some of the
5	choices that one has to, you know, use for this type
6	of enclosure.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. Okay.
8	Interesting. All right. Good. Anything else?
9	Questions at this point? If there's nothing further,
10	let's move ahead. Anything else you would like to
11	point our attention to, at this time?
12	MR. AGBIM: No, not at this time.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
14	MR. AGBIM: All right.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Let me ask, is the
16	ANC present? Is a representative of the ANC here?
17	MS. ROBINSON: Here.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Do you have any
19	cross examination questions of the applicant?
20	Questions?
21	MS. ROBINSON: Yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Why
23	don't you come forward?
24	MS. ROBINSON: Good morning.
25	MS. SCOTT: Good morning.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: A very good morning 2 to you. 3 MS. ROBINSON: My name is Naomi Robinson. 4 I'm ANC Commissioner 7E Chairperson. 5 MS. SCOTT: And mine is Marline Scott, ANC-705, that's my Single Member District. 6 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Perfect. Okay. 8 This is your time to conduct cross examination. So 9 what you have is just questions of the applicant's representative here of any of their information. 10 August the 18th Mr. 11 MS. ROBINSON: Yes. 12 Kamara came to our meeting, ANC community meeting and made a presentation concerning his building that he 13 The writing that I have it is a four unit 14 15 apartment building. We, as commissioners, are opposed to any more apartment buildings being in that area. 16 The apartment building that he mentioned that's beside 17 where he want to build is closed, boarded up now and 18 19 is bad. It's a drug infested place on North Avenue. 20 So we, this Commission 7E, voted not to 21 have any more apartment buildings in that area. Okay. 22 23 Mr. Kamara talked to someone and he gave me a letter from -- you sent a clarification. He said that it 24 25 I don't have wasn't apartments, it's a condo.

1	anything in writing from you to say it's a condo. I
2	don't know the difference between what he said as
3	apartment and a condo, but an apartment is an
4	apartment, and a condo is different, you know, because
5	you are buying your own.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. Good.
7	MS. ROBINSON: So that is our complaint.
8	We don't want any apartments in there.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. So it's
10	apartments that you don't want?
11	MS. ROBINSON: That's correct.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So there is one
13	question I glean from that, which we will get to in a
14	minute. But let me ask, you have indicated that the
15	adjacent building is a boarded up problem apartment
16	building.
17	MS. ROBINSON: Yes, a large apartment
18	building.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Sure, sure. And is
20	that the basis of not wanting any other apartment
21	buildings?
22	MS. ROBINSON: No, no, that's not it.
23	It's the whole area, that Marshall Heights area.
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes.
25	MS. ROBINSON: Which the apartment

buildings and they have been condemned, closed down,
boarded up and we're rebuilding that whole area with
other developers. HOPE 6 is coming, is in the area
and everything, so we are building up that area. And
to put apartment buildings in there now where people
do not take care of their apartment buildings, because
it's not their's, it's deterrent to me.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I see.
MS. ROBINSON: To put it there besides
someone is buying something.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
MS. ROBINSON: The houses are one private
home, that's on the left side of where he is building
and I have talked to Ms. Julia Reeves.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
MS. ROBINSON: She called me yesterday and
told me she couldn't make it down to the hearing. She
also said that she had talked to Mr. Kamara and she
said she had no problem if it's a condo.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I see. And does the
ANC have any problem if it's a condo?
MS. ROBINSON: No, no.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. So
MS. ROBINSON: Although
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: your concern, as

I am understanding the testimony from the ANC, is that 2 you have found in the past that apartment buildings care and 3 well-taken of the 4 themselves don't take care of their own units. MS. ROBINSON: That's correct. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And so your concern 6 is of that having more type of product, more 8 apartments that would then lead to more deteriorated 9 buildings and lack of care? 10 MS. ROBINSON: Yes. 11 MS. SCOTT: Yes. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. So it sounds 12 like it's a quick question here. 13 Is this condominium or an apartment building? 14 MR. AGBIM: It's a condominium. 15 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And can you certify 16 that? 17 MR. AGBIM: Four unit condominium. 18 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I mean, is there any 19 way that you can put into the record that that is what 20 is happening to alleviate the ANC's concerns? 21 Yes. Actually, the statement 22 MR. AGBIM: on the application did mention apartment, primarily 23 because that was the only use that we thought was 24 25 appropriate as far as zoning was concerned, but --

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Let me 2 clarify that point very quickly. 3 MR. AGBIM: All right. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Obviously, when they 5 put an application in to come here, there's nothing in 6 the Zoning Regulations that differentiates between condominium and apartment building. So what he is 8 saying is that he put an application in and labeled it 9 apartment building, because that's all that 10 regulations address. However, there is more. The actual project he is indicating is a condominium. 11 12 It's a for sale product, not a rental. Does that make 13 sense? MS. ROBINSON: Yes. 14 15 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okav. MS. ROBINSON: Yes. 16 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What else? 17 MR. AGBIM: That's pretty much it. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Anything else you would like to provide? 20 21 MS. ROBINSON: I want to make a credit for the record now this is going to be condominium, a four 22 unit condo, right? 23 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's exactly what 24 25 he said.

1	MR. AGBIM: Condominium, right.
2	MS. ROBINSON: Well, it's best that we
3	have no problem, because even Mrs. Reeves called me
4	and said if it's a condo, that people would have to
5	buy their own, they feel they take care of them
6	better. She had no problem with it. And Ms. Reeves
7	is the lady who live in the only house that's there
8	right next to the place.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's right. If
10	you're facing the building, it's on the left side.
11	MR. AGBIM: Right.
12	MS. ROBINSON: Yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Down the hill a
14	little bit.
15	MS. ROBINSON: Yes, yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes, okay.
17	MS. ROBINSON: Okay.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Who lives in the
19	blue house behind?
20	MS. ROBINSON: There is no other house on
21	that side.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, behind it. I'm
23	talking about the rear of the property.
24	MR. AGBIM: On Bass Place. There's a blue
25	house on Bass Place, right.

MS. ROBINSON: I don't remember who is on 2 Bass Place. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MS. ROBINSON: We didn't go to Bass Place. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Okay. It's a very vibrant blue house. I see it in the pictures up 6 here. 8 MS. ROBINSON: I don't know. Do you know 9 who lives there? 10 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Excellent. I think I understand very clearly the ANC's 11 Good. 12 concern and I think they have made an excellent point I'll allow the applicant to conduct any on this. 13 cross examination of the ANC members if they have any 14 15 questions? MR. AGBIM: No. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Board Members? Ms. Miller? 18 19 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I just want to ask the applicant just to be clear, how can the ANC be assured 20 21 that your building is going to be condominium instead of apartments. 22 23 MR. AGBIM: I think DCRA has an office that's responsible for condominium conversion and you 24 25 don't have to have a C of O for the project to be

condominiums, rated as condominiums. And if need be, there may be something in the approval that says no C of O should be issued for a four unit rental apartment building or a rental license issued. Because those two things will preclude the use of the building as apartments, as rental apartments.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. So you're

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. So you're saying that will happen at the permitting process?

MR. AGBIM: Right.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: No? You're not saying that?

MR. AGBIM: Permitting? I'm saying a rental license permitting.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

MR. AGBIM: For condominium conversion process. Basically, the difference is that an apartment has a rental license to operate an apartment building. And if you're not issued a rental license, the building cannot never be or shouldn't be rented out as apartments, individual apartments. So once that is precluded, then the owner of the property will have no other choice and they will be assured that a rental license will never be issued for this property. But the property can be converted into condominiums.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: And it's also your

NEAL R. GROSS

word in this proceeding that it is going to be a condominium? 2 MR. AGBIM: Yes, the term for the project 3 is to have four for sale condominiums. 4 5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Anything 6 else? 8 ROBINSON: Yes, I want to say one 9 little thing about this. I'm not thinking about this. He can do it either way. So what I'm saying, I want 10 the word condominium being in there, no apartments. 11 12 See, that's what I want to see. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. 13 MS. ROBINSON: Because this is what the 14 15 community wants. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. 16 17 MS. ROBINSON: But what he is saying, if I understand he is saying, it could be either way. 18 19 MR. AGBIM: No, no. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: 20 No. What he is is that, it may have been a little bit 21 saying confusing, there is going to be a first step where it 22 23 is pretty much on the track of a condominium and he is his condominium 24 going to put in to start 25 documentation.

MR. AGBIM: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: His condo docs, which the District will take up, review, it will go through several iterations, there's going to be a site plan, etcetera, and then there is a very legal document that will set up the condominium association. It's an awful lot of work. Has that been started?

MR. AGBIM: No.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. I think we're going to have to just take into an assessment of how we feel secure enough to proceed with that as what is being set forth. But I think we fully understand the ANC's position of wanting a home ownership opportunity here.

MR. AGBIM: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Not rental.

MS. ROBINSON: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Okay. Good.

If there's nothing further on that end then, let's move on to the Office of Planning's report, which was, of course, timely filed. It's Exhibit No. 26. And a very good morning.

MR. JESICK: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board. My name is Matt Jesick.

I'm with the Office of Planning. I would mostly like

NEAL R. GROSS

to stand on the record this morning, but I would just like to reemphasize the update to the grading plan.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good.

MR. JESICK: I believe the number 4 feet for the height of the retaining wall was used this morning, but in my reading of the latest plans that Office of Planning has received, I hope it's the same set of plans that the Board has, in my reading of those plans, it looks like the maximum height of the wall would be 2 to 3 feet above the adjacent grade. This is one of the issues that section 353 requires the Office of Planning to look at is the grading of the site. And that was one of our concerns as we reviewed it.

And we had hoped while retaining walls can be found throughout this neighborhood, because it is a hilly neighborhood, we had hoped that the development of the property would respect the natural grade as much as possible. So that was definitely something we worked hard on with the applicant. And the latest plans that I have show that the top of the wall would be 161.5 feet above the adjacent grade of 159 feet or slightly less than 159 on the neighbor's property.

In addition to that, I would also note that I believe the applicant has been working with the

NEAL R. GROSS

1 Department of Housing and Community Development 2 secure financing for this project, so that might be 3 another way, another safeguard to guarantee that it's a condominium project and that the units can be made affordable. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent point. 6 You're getting DHCD planning? 8 MR. AGBIM: Yes, yes. 9 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Through what 10 program? I'm sorry, I don't have the 11 MR. AGBIM: 12 documentation here. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. 13 MR. AGBIM: But they are -- one of the 14 requirements that they have given me is approval by 15 the Board and once they have approval, they will start 16 17 to process the paperwork. 18 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But is the Sure. 19 financing program of what you're --20 MR. AGBIM: It's a financing program specially geared towards this area for provision of 21 home ownership opportunities. 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. 23 Then I think that would, obviously, be as close to a certification 24 25 of an ownership opportunity.

MR. AGBIM: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That we could have. So we'll address that at the end. Not a problem. Good. And Mr. Etherly is also noting that, and it's timely to say, we do have the recommendation of approval from DHCD Director, Mr. Green, also in the record, which is part of the 353, 410 requirements of referral to housing. Very well. Follow-up questions from the Board of the Office of Planning? Mr. Etherly?

BOARD MEMBER ETHERLY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. No questions for Mr. Jesick. Thank you very much for the report. I'll just note as the Chair indicated in Exhibit No. 22 from the Department of Housing and Community Development that that exhibit does describe the applicant's proposal as being for the construction of four new for sale residential units. So just as further perhaps security and comfort for the ANC regarding the for sale aspect of this project as opposed to rental. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent point.

Thank you. Ms. Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Jesick, I'm just curious when the Office of Planning assesses a

NEAL R. GROSS

building of this sort under 353 and 410, is there anywhere on the Comprehensive Plan or the new Draft Comprehensive Plan where the Office of Planning would consider whether the building was condominium home ownership versus apartment use?

MR. JESICK: Well, the first point, I guess, is at this time we weren't referred to the new Comprehensive Plan until it's officially adopted and once it is, obviously, we would give that the most weight. At this time, there is no provision in the Zoning Regulations in section 353 that requires us to look at the nature of the end product, how that will be either sold or rented or what the financing of that would be.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okav. Thank you. curious, because Okay. just was Ι mean, understand we see our regulations and what they say and then there is also the Comprehensive Plan, which is a pretty big document and sometimes that has some broad themes in there and I was just curious whether, I know it's not in your report and the ANC has brought up this point, and so I was just curious whether in that context one might look at that.

MR. JESICK: Like --

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Character of the

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	neighborhood or something like that. I don't know.
2	MR. JESICK: Well, I know certainly the
3	Comprehensive Plan, of course, encourages home
4	ownership and specifically the Ward 7 Plan encourages
5	home ownership and affordable home ownership. I guess
6	for this case, we just looked at the very basics of
7	the Comprehensive Plan being the land use designation
8	and this as being moderate density residential that
9	conforms with that designation.
10	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. Okay. Thank
11	you.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Anything
13	else? Any other questions? Yes?
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
15	Mr. Jesick, did you talk to the applicant about
16	lighting or anything when you looked at the plan?
17	MR. JESICK: No, that issue did not come
18	up.
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Do you
20	MR. JESICK: We would certainly be
21	supportive of establishing a lighting standard for the
22	rear parking lot. Obviously, light spill over is
23	something we don't want to see on adjacent properties.
24	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
25	MR. JESICK: So we would be supportive of

	46
1	that.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Anything
4	else?
5	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I have one other
6	question. Did you get any response from DDOT with
7	respect to this application?
8	MR. JESICK: The Office of Planning has
9	not received a report from DDOT. This is an area that
10	is in need of some streetscape improvements and I know
11	that the applicant has said he is willing to work with
12	DDOT to on the sidewalk and curb issues that exist
13	out there now.
14	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Anything else? Does
16	the ANC have any questions of the Office of Planning?
17	MS. ROBINSON: No.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No. Okay. Do you
19	have the Office of Planning's report?
20	MS. ROBINSON: No, we do not.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Well, we're going to
22	get you a copy before you leave today.
23	MS. ROBINSON: Thank you.
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well. If
25	there's nothing else, I don't have any other attendant

Government reports on this application outside of those that we have already mentioned. We have heard from the ANC. We appreciate that. Let me ask then if there are other persons present for Application 17515, persons that would like to provide testimony in support or in opposition can come forward at this time.

Very well. Not noting any other persons present, we'll turn it over to you for any closing you might have. Actually, before remarks that closings, let's get all this together. This is what I would like to do. I would like to set this off for a decision making. I would like to keep the record open for a few submissions. Just the identification of the type of financing or the program of which DHCD you are coming under. That will, I think, substantiate better, as Mr. Etherly has highlighted, the record, that will be already in some clarification.

Now, let's talk about the lighting and the landscaping on this. Are you running power in your retaining wall at all?

MR. AGBIM: No.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Great. Okay. And one of the concerns Mr. Turnbull is delicately

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

touching upon is this spill over of light and what we have found, I think, in common practice is if you have flood lights on the back of that building to flood the back parking lot, that it may well shine out into the rear, if not the side properties. That wouldn't be appropriate.

What are your potential availabilities for lighting at the rear of the surface parking area? One, I would like to have you submit just cut sheets on proposed types of lighting or the specifics that would be the wall-mounted lights, certainly on the sides, the drive side, the side yard side and then the rear. And then I would like you to address how you would, in addition if you -- well, here are the options.

At the rear if you're going to have building mounted fixtures, let us know how those would not impact.

MR. AGBIM: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And/or do you have opportunity to put actual, maybe even pole mounted fixtures?

MR. AGBIM: Pole mounted, right.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: On the back. Here is my thought just looking at this very quickly. If

NEAL R. GROSS

you are trenching to do a retaining wall and surface, it may not be out of the range of the budget to actually run a line there for a pole light.

MR. AGBIM: Conduits, right, right.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You know that better than I. But I think that would be appropriate to see. What else? Oh, if you get far enough along, I would keep the record open for a submission of the trash enclosure, just any sort of plan or detail section or elevation, whatever you're going to do or even just more specific notes.

MR. AGBIM: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: However you're going to document it. I think that would be good to have in the record. What else am I missing? Anything else in addition? Okay. Let me see if I understand this. So to take trash out, two last questions, an owner would walk out of the front of the building and conceivably walk down the sidewalk and then back up to the trash receptacle or they would walk down their steps, stay on the property line and walk over to the enclosure?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ AGBIM: Yes, they would have to walk out of the step and --

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Do the steps drop right onto the sidewalk?

NEAL R. GROSS

	30
1	MR. AGBIM: Yes.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. So that's
3	what they would do.
4	MR. AGBIM: Right.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: They would come out
6	on the sidewalk and then back up and around.
7	MR. AGBIM: Right.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. That sounds
9	interesting. All right. I don't have any other
10	zoning concerns with that. Let me ask you a quick
11	question. Building code allows a single stair on a
12	four story building?
13	MR. AGBIM: Yes.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Anything
15	else? Good. Wow. How much time do you need to get
16	that information into the record?
17	MR. AGBIM: Two days.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Two days?
19	MR. AGBIM: Actually, I have that
20	information already. I just need to compile it.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: The lighting cut
22	sheets, the DHCD?
23	MR. AGBIM: Right, right.
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: The
25	MR. AGBIM: Well, not the DHCD. I have to
	NEAL P. GPOSS

	51
1	probably talk to somebody to write a letter or
2	something.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
4	MR. AGBIM: All right.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Two days realistic?
6	MR. AGBIM: Right.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Then
8	let's have this in no later than noon on Friday.
9	MR. AGBIM: Okay.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: If we do that, we'll
11	be able to put this on our decision making, our Public
12	Meeting next Tuesday, the 3 rd .
13	MR. AGBIM: Okay.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: In which case, what
15	I would like to request is that you submit into the
16	record, how do I say it, not a lot of paperwork.
17	MR. AGBIM: All right.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Meaning there should
19	only be a couple of papers there, that's what we're
20	asking for.
21	MR. AGBIM: Right.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Because it's going
23	to have to be faxed out to us.
24	MR. AGBIM: Right.
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: To make it by the
	NEAL B. CROSS

3rd.

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. AGBIM: Right, right.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So you'll put it in here by Thursday, no later than 12:00 on Friday and also provide a copy over to the ANC of that submission.

MR. AGBIM: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And last direction, of course, if you can or not if you can, would you, please, provide also with the cut sheets on the light fixtures where they are being located? Some sort of identification.

MR. AGBIM: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Just so we know. Even if you just write it on the cut sheet, this is side yard, driveway, front, rear.

MR. AGBIM: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Obviously, that will help us, because when we call this for decision on the $3^{\rm rd}$, there will not be a time for you to address the Board again.

MR. AGBIM: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: This will just be our decision making. We will have a complete record and you will hear publicly the Board deliberate on all

NEAL R. GROSS

the facts and requirements as laid out the 2 regulations and then we will make a decision based on So this would be our last opportunity to ask 3 4 questions of you for clarification. 5 MR. AGBIM: Right. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: However, as I have 6 indicated, we have kept the record open for several 8 submissions. Very well. Anything else? Anything 9 else you want to highlight? MR. AGBIM: No, no, this is it. 10 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. 11 12 MR. AGBIM: All right. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Do you have any 13 questions? 14 MS. ROBINSON: No. Everything is fine. 15 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Good. As you 16 17 heard, we're going to have a couple more submissions in just to substantiate what we've all talked about 18 On the 3^{rd} we will call this for decision. 19 here today. You can watch us on the website. You don't need to 20 be down here. 21 MS. ROBINSON: Yes. 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You are welcome to 23 come down, of course. It will be a Public Meeting. 24

There wouldn't be any other opportunity to provide the

54 1 Board with information or ask questions or the Board to ask questions of you. Anything else then, Board 2 Members? Very well. We'll set this then for decision 3 on the 3^{rd} and we will see all this in by no later than 4 Friday at 12:00 and I'll get it out to the Board at that time. 6 Very well. Thank you very much. 8 MR. AGBIM: All right. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: We do appreciate it. 9 10 MR. AGBIM: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Ms. Bailey, 11 12 is there any other business for the Board this morning? 13 MS. BAILEY: No, Mr. Chairman. 14 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: 15 Fascinating. Ιf there's no other business then, let's move on and 16 adjourn the morning session. 17

(Whereupon, the Public Hearing was recessed at 10:44 a.m. to reconvene at 1:08 p.m.)

20

18

19

21

22

A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

1:08 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON Good afternoon, GRIFFIS: ladies and gentlemen. Let me call to order the afternoon hearing of the Board of Zoning Adjustment of the District of Columbia. It is the 26th of September 2006. My name is Geoff Griffis, Chairperson. Joining me today is the Vice Chair, Ms. Miller, and our esteemed colleague, Mr. Etherly, will be joining us in The pitter patter of his feet are upon any second. Representing the National Capital Planning Commission is Mr. Mann and representing the Zoning Commission with us this afternoon is Mr. Turnbull.

Copies of today's hearing agenda are available for you. You should note we have one hearing scheduled for this afternoon, so it won't be that difficult to get through that chronology.

Several very important aspects of the opening statement I'll get through very quickly, however. First of all, it should be known that all proceedings before the Board of Zoning are held in the open and before the public. Attendant to that, they are also recorded. They are recorded in two fashions, the Court Reporter on the floor to my right. Please, fill out two witness cards prior to coming forward, so

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that the recorder has your name and connection to the case at hand. We are also being broadcast live on the Office of Zoning's website.

The order of procedure for the appeal application of which is scheduled for this afternoon We will hear the statement and will be as follows: witnesses of the appellant, we will hear the Zoning Administrator and other Government officials present We will then go to the case for the their case. owner/lessee, if there is such designated. Then we will hear from the ANC. Then we will hear intervenors that have been allowed and permitted by And then finally, the Board. we will rebuttal/closings by the appellant.

I'll get through all the details and other aspects, so that we don't take up the time in openings, as they are required for each specific element in the cases that we call, meaning we may set time on each side for appellants and intervenors, etcetera, and I'll give cross examination direction if it is required.

However, it should be known that the record will be closed at the conclusion of the hearing on this case. We will make note of any additional information that is required for the record in which

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the record would stay open for, I will obviously detail all that at the end of the hearing. So no one will leave without fully understanding all the specifics and requirements that they are facing.

The Sunshine Act does require that the Board hold its hearings in the open and before the public. We do enter into Executive Sessions at times, often for reviewing records on cases. This is in accordance with our rules, regulations and procedures. It's also in accordance with the Sunshine Act.

I would ask that you turn off your cell phones and beepers, at this time, so we don't have a disruption of the transmission of these proceedings. And I would also indicate that, of course, all the record that is based on the Public Hearing is what we will deliberate on an so we do ask that people not engage Board Members in conversation outside of the Public Hearing today as we would perhaps give the appearance of receiving information that isn't within the public record.

Let me say a very good afternoon to Ms. Bailey with the Office of Zoning, Mr. Moy with the Office of Zoning, also on my left. I think, at this point, why don't we take attendance? No, we don't need to do that after all. I will ask though that

NEAL R. GROSS

people that are going to address the Board this afternoon if you would, please, stand and give you attention to Ms. Bailey, she is going to swear you in.

MS. BAILEY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. At this point then, we can move on to preliminary matters. Preliminary matters are those which relate to whether a case will or should proceed today. Classically, postings or recordations or other elements going towards preliminary matters, of course, all of them reach the fact of whether a case will or should proceed today. I would ask you to come forward and have a seat at the table if you have a preliminary matter for the Board's attention, at this time. And a very good afternoon, Mr. Gottlieb.

MR. GOTTLIEB: Good afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I presume.

MR. GOTTLIEB: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. I'm here before you today on a case which was filed some months ago. we came before you in July, the city had moved for a continuance because the city's attorney could not make the session and a continuance was granted to today. you may recall, the case was plagued by a As disappearance of all documentation relating to the

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

construction site. I filed --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I'm sorry. just get you on point, a preliminary matter. You have 3 a preliminary matter? MR. GOTTLIEB: Yes. I'm sorry. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. 6 MR. GOTTLIEB: I just wanted to give the 8 record -- I'll cut to the chase. 9 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: We're very up to 10 speed on this. 11 MR. GOTTLIEB: I'm sorry about that. 12 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's all right. MR. GOTTLIEB: I'm here before you to ask 13 for a continuance. The other side in this case, the 14 city, I know they filed a motion to dismiss. I have 15 spoken with Mr. Crews and with the city's attorney and 16 17 they have consented to a continuance at this time. The ANC --18 19 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What's the basis of it? 20 MR. GOTTLIEB: The basis of it is that the 21 -- at this point, all the documentation has not been 22 provided and the city has offered and I have accepted 23 to try to work with them to go through the points that 24 25 I have raised and to try to work a settlement out

outside of the Board. And I think both sides feel that they can proceed in good faith and hopefully avoid a legal proceeding.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

MS. BROWN: Mr. Griffis, when it's appropriate, I would like to address that.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Sure, sure, sure.

MS. BROWN: Is now the appropriate time?

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No.

MS. BROWN: Okay.

aback on the aspect. Maybe I'll hear more about it, but I'm not sure a settlement or a negotiation outside has anything to do with us. We either have an assertion of an error in this case or not. And if there is, then it's properly before us to decide whether that error is of standing or not. So I'm not really sure what you are asking to postpone for to go in and work and see if you can work something out.

Let me just say that and I'll -- let me hear from everybody and then we can get to the rest of perhaps my concern, but maybe others. Yes?

MS. BROWN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Carolyn Brown with the Law Firm of Holland

and Knight here on behalf of the property owner,

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Decker Development. I think there is one important ingredient missing from this request for a continuance and that is that the appellant never contacted the property owner. We have been on record being part of this proceeding, so we do not consent to the continuance. In fact, we strenuously oppose it. believe this simply amounts continuation of what I believe is a frivolous appeal. We see no reason to indulge in a fishing expedition for some zoning violation that just doesn't exist. believe it's a waste of time, money and energy. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Understood. MS. BROWN: And I will just leave it at that. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. I have got plenty more reasons MS. BROWN: to share with you, but I will leave it at that. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right, right. And, Gottlieb, in your opening I don't think you Mr. mentioned, I didn't hear it, the actual motion also to dispense from the property owner. Mr. Crews, do you have a comment on this? just talking about, at this point, preliminary matter of postponement.

CREWS:

ADMIN.

ZONING

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr.

Right.

Chairman, I think what we're trying to do is be able to further explain our calculations on why we think that the permit was properly issued and the appellant has asked for more time for us to visit together. He has also brought up some other concerns that are probably not before us, before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, but I think we can satisfy his concerns on how we came up with the calculations and address the other issues in an appropriate forum and, therefore, maybe everybody's time with save likelihood of withdrawal of the appeal. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What is the appropriate forum that you speak of? ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: Well, he had couple of other issues along with the Advisorv Neighborhood Commission that are not believe are zoning issues, but that are concerns of the neighbors and of the construction and the impact on the neighborhood. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: And we have contacted the other agencies --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I see. ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: -- involved in that, you know, to kind of again help explain whether those

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	are correct or not, and then we would go more to the
2	Building Code.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Gotcha.
4	ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: And the
5	environmental statutes.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good.
7	ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: Rather than zoning.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Understood. All
9	right. Ms. Gates?
10	MS. GATES: I just need a point of
11	clarification, Mr. Chairman. It was my understanding
12	that Mr. Gottlieb filed the appeal citing failure of
13	DCRA. I did not realize
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What are the areas
15	asserted?
16	MS. GATES: Well, I don't have a copy of
17	the thing immediately in front of me.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. I'm sorry.
19	We'll get you a copy.
20	MS. GATES: Those were the two. Those
21	were the two parties. Ms. Brown is now seeking to
22	dismiss. I don't think that is her role here. I want
23	to question that.
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Ms. Brown, do
25	you want to speak to your intervenor status?

MS. BROWN: Yes. As you know, under the 2 rules there are several parties that are granted 3 automatic party status under the appeals. Right along with the ANC is the property owner to the proceeding, and that is the basis for our intervention and our motion to dismiss. 6 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. Understood. 8 Actually, let's just pull it out. 9 MS. GATES: Okay. MS. BROWN: I have the cite here in front 10 11 of me, too. 12 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: It's --MS. BROWN: It's 3199.1. 13 MS. GATES: The case involves the granting 14 15 of a building permit. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: An appeal, this is 16 17 an appeal. 18 MS. GATES: That's right. 19 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Before the BZA and the appeal is laid out as one of the jurisdictional 20 21 proceedings before us and in that there are rules and establishments, much like in a variance where we 22 establish parties and the criterion for establishing 23 those parties in an appeal, it's a different aspect 24

and a party is defined -- an intervenor is defined in

1	an appeal as a definition under administrative
2	procedures as including the building owner. So I
3	don't see any way we would not have them as a
4	participant in the appeal.
5	MS. GATES: I seem to recall a case
6	earlier this year in which the ANC was involved with
7	Morten Bender. We filed the appeal and were told we
8	had no right to do so and the Board accepted that,
9	upheld that.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I'm sorry, who filed
11	the appeal?
12	MS. GATES: The ANC.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And the property
14	owner was not allowed to be an intervenor in the
15	appeal?
16	MS. GATES: No, the ANC was not recognized
17	in that appeal.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That doesn't make
19	any sense to me at all. I would love to look at that.
20	MS. GATES: It didn't to us either at the
21	time, but
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I can imagine.
23	Okay. Well, how does that directly correlate to why
24	the owner in this case would not be a participant?
25	MS. GATES: Because the owner did not have

-- did not issue the building permit. DCRA did and that is the matter upon which this case has been filed.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I see. Okay. Okay.

Good. I think I understand your position.

Questions, Board Members? Ms. Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well, just on that point because I don't recall the other case, but in this case if you look at the definition of party under 3199 it says, you know, both the ANC is a party as of right, as well as the owner.

But I do have a question for Mr. Crews that is did you not provide the documents that you said you were going to be providing relevant to this appeal to Mr. Gottlieb?

ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: I thought we did. There were some additional questions on how the calculations that we provided were arrived at, and I think that was the issue that we have not had a chance to go over with him. But I think that we provided the documentations to both the ANC and then the applicant through the ANC several weeks ago, and I would defer to them to confirm or --

MS. BROWN: Mrs. Miller, if I could answer your question a little more specifically. The

NEAL R. GROSS

property owner provided to Mr. Gottlieb a full size set of stamped, approved drawings on Friday, July 21st.

That was the -
VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right.

MS. BROWN: Tuesday the 18th was the day that you all had the hearing. Then on August 3rd the DCRA forwarded copies of the entire file, all the papers in the permit file plus drawings as well.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right.

MS. BROWN: So that was on August 3rd.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. And I -- and you stated that in your motion to dismiss and I wanted to just make sure that Mr. Crews agrees with that.

I just -- you know, I mean, the issue that I understand that is still pending is the calculation of the floor area ratio, which applies in this case, because we're in the Wesley Heights Overlay District which has a floor area ratio limit. And I believe that that is -- and we did provide those calculations, but what we probably haven't been able to clarify yet is how -- probably how those calculations were --

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.

ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: -- come about, especially with the basement and the fenestration.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I don't find that we
2	have ever granted nor do I find that as a basis for a
3	postponement based on the fact that we need to have
4	clarification of the participants in an appeal
5	understanding each other's sides or calculations. So,
6	again, I don't
7	MR. GOTTLIEB: If I could just respond.
8	VICE CHAIR MILLER: When were the
9	calculations provided? Do we know?
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: There were no
11	calculations provided. Documents were provided.
12	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Oh, okay.
13	MR. GOTTLIEB: I filed on June 29 th a FOIA
14	request and I can show you it.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's all right.
16	What is it?
17	MR. GOTTLIEB: So you can read it for
18	yourselves.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That has got to go
20	in to Ms. Bailey.
21	MR. GOTTLIEB: Well, I'll read it. You
22	know, if you want I can read it to you. It's very,
23	very extensive. It's a four page letter.
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, but I understand

that.

1	MR. GOTTLIEB: That's fine.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I mean, I understand
3	that.
4	MR. GOTTLIEB: I never got a response to
5	this.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, I understand
7	that.
8	MR. GOTTLIEB: There were
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Have a seat, Mr.
10	Gottlieb, please.
11	MR. GOTTLIEB: There were numerous
12	investigations done.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: My question is not
14	whether you got documents or not or whether you were
15	able to do the calculations. What you have said to me
16	today is you want to postpone this hearing, of which
17	we set the entire afternoon up for, in order to sit
18	with Mr. Crews to understand his calculations. That
19	is not a basis for an appeal. You're here because
20	you're asserting he made a mistake.
21	MR. GOTTLIEB: Right.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So now, you're going
23	to tell us where his mistakes were and he is going to
24	defend his calculations. Going back and striking

deals and making sure everyone is happy on all these

70 issues is great. Go do that. We're not involved. 2 MR. GOTTLIEB: Okay. So I'm not sure 3 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: 4 where our involvement is. If you want to postpone for 5 that, actually you're asking to withdraw of which I'm happy to grant if you think you can work it out with 6 Mr. Crews. I have yet to hear why we're not going 8 forward today. 9 GOTTLIEB: Okay, sir, two points. MR. First of all, I submitted a FOIA request June 29th, 10 okay, a request for documents. Okay? I got -- in the 11 12 end of August, I got a copy from the city of the plans, okay, and the building permit. Last week I got 13 a report on a wall check. That was last week. Ι 14 15 never got a formal response to this and I never got other inspection reports that were done pursuant to 16 requests from myself and other neighbors over the 17 course of the last six months. 18

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But help me understand how a wall check, inspections, any of that has to do with substantiating your assertion in the appeal.

MR. GOTTLIEB: Well, for instance, with a wall check it's my understanding if a neighbor complained that they are building on her land, okay,

NEAL R. GROSS

19

20

21

22

23

24

71
and that the wall is too close, doesn't meet the
minimum requirements, and DCRA sends somebody out to
measure it, the results of that measurement and that
inspection are something that would be material to me
in proving my case whether or not the requirements of
the code are met in terms of the side yard
requirements.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But a wall check is
after it's your appeal, the basis of your appeal,
is the issuance of the permit not what happened in
construction. So right now I would throw out the wall
check.
MD COMMITTED Miles and I whomby in

MR. GOTTLIEB: The wall check though is the city's look to see whether the permit was granted properly.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, the wall check is the city's look at whether it complies with the permit that was issued and you're appealing the permit. We wouldn't even get into the construction. We wouldn't even get into the wall check.

MR. GOTTLIEB: If you're telling me that the city doesn't care whether --

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, I'm not saying that at all. I'm saying --

MR. GOTTLIEB: -- the permit was issued

NEAL R. GROSS

legally or not --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You need to be sure 3 you understand what I'm saying. You brought an appeal of the issuance of a permit. There was nothing built at the time of that issuance of the permit. Our clock and time stops with Mr. Crews signing those documents 6 and they went out the door. 8 MR. GOTTLIEB: Right. 9 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: How and what has 10 been built has no jurisdiction to us at this point in your appeal, what you brought to us. 11 12 MR. GOTTLIEB: Well, if it is shown that the drawings are fraudulent, certainly that would be 13 something I would think you would care about. 14 15 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I don't even know what that means. What do you mean fraudulent? Do you 16 17 mean --MS. GATES: Chairman Griffis, 18 may I 19 follow-up on something you have just said? CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. 20 MS. GATES: And it was the issuance of the 21 This permit is dated January 17, 2000 --22 permit. excuse me, I have looked at the wrong date, January 23

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

17, 2006.

24

MS. GATES: Now, the ANC's letter dated
January 10 th July 10, 2006 refers back to a permit
that I know Mr. Crews saw, I saw, Barbara Ingersoll,
the next door neighbor, and Mr. Gottlieb saw that said
alteration/repair existing proposed floor plans,
mechanical, electrical, plumbing plans, new kitchen.
There was no new addition on that permit that was
hanging in the window.
Somewhere between our letter, when these
plans were these were finally delivered to us, that
permit has been changed and re-posted. The house was
well, well constructed by January. It was obvious.
It had been doubled in size, but the permit wasn't
even issued according to this until January.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What does that have
to do with postponing today?
MS. GATES: I don't know what it has to do
with postponing.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
MS. GATES: I'm saying there are
irregularities.
MR. GOTTLIEB: I think, Mr. Chairman, I
guess I don't quite understand your point. I am here
before you with three of the four parties to this
proceeding. Three of the four have agreed that it's

in the public interest to postpone the proceeding and 2 spare the Government the time and expense of litigating this. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I have no problem if 5 you withdraw. Not only before you, but MR. GOTTLIEB: 6 any appeals, and I'm hearing you're telling us that 8 no, you don't want -- you would prefer parties to 9 litigate not to settle outside the proceeding. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No. 10 MR. GOTTLIEB: And you would prefer to 11 this 12 spend afternoon and subsequent afternoons litigating this case and having the city litigate and 13 citizens litigate. 14 Not at all. 15 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: perfectly open to taking your withdrawal today. 16 MR. GOTTLIEB: No, I did not withdraw, 17 sir. I asked for a continuance. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And then you're asking for everything. 20 MR. GOTTLIEB: If you're forcing me to 21 withdraw, I think that's also against public policy. 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I'm not forcing you 23 at all. I'm addressing your motion. You are bringing 24 25 me a motion for postponement, because you want to go

work it out with Mr. Crews, the Zoning Administrator, and I'm telling you that I have no jurisdiction, if you want to go work with him, to somehow work it all out.

But you're scheduled for an appeal today that is ripe to go according to your submissions at this point, and I don't see where it serves this Board in postponing and setting this for a whole other date some, frankly, six to eight months from now and then have to come back when the whole purpose, our jurisdiction, is to hear appeals by your assertion that there was an error.

There is nothing that could be cured that would remove you from our proceedings unless there actually is no basis for an appeal.

MR. GOTTLIEB: Sir, let me just read from the transcript from Tuesday, July $18^{\rm th}$ of 2006.

"Mr. Gottlieb: Do you have an alternate"

-- you say that the date of the -- you will move this
to the 26th of December. "Mr. Gottlieb: Do you have
an alternate date? Chairman Griffis: January '07.

Mr. Gottlieb: You know, I guess my -- it depends on
when I see all the documents." Further on, "Mr.

Chairman, I also submitted a FOIA request. Chairman
Griffis: Right. Mr. Gottlieb: On the 29th of June

NEAL R. GROSS

1	so, you know, if the city responds to it, which they
2	haven't so far, great. If they don't respond to it
3	then, you know. Chairman Griffis: Yes. Mr.
4	Gottlieb: I am not going to have the documents that I
5	need. Chairman Griffis: Yes, yes."
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I got that. I was
7	here.
8	MR. GOTTLIEB: "So I guess, you know, can
9	we tentatively say the 26 th ? Mr. Gottlieb: If there
10	is a problem, I guess we can visit that on the 26 th ."
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What is your point?
12	MR. GOTTLIEB: "Chairman Griffis:
13	Indeed."
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Mr. Gottlieb,
15	please.
16	MR. GOTTLIEB: "Chairman Griffis: Worst
17	case, we would be looking at not proceeding on the
18	26 th , but I certainly hope that we would not be in that
19	frame."
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Listen. I will
21	absolutely respect everything and listen to what you
22	say, but let's get to the point. What are you trying
23	to accomplish today?
24	MR. GOTTLIEB: The point is I
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You have the

1	documentation.
2	MR. GOTTLIEB: requested FOIA on the
3	29 th of June.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So you have had
5	enough time.
6	MR. GOTTLIEB: It is now almost October
7	and I have not had a response from the City of the
8	District of Columbia.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What are you waiting
10	for? Do you have the plans?
11	MR. GOTTLIEB: I have the plans, yes.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So you have the
13	permit plans that were issued.
14	MR. GOTTLIEB: Right.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What else are you
16	waiting for?
17	MR. GOTTLIEB: I'm waiting for all other
18	documents.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Why would that
20	why would we hold up an appeal for all other
21	documents? Let me ask you another question. What is
22	the error in the permit documents that you have found?
23	MR. GOTTLIEB: The 30 percent lot
24	occupancy under the Wesley Heights Overlay, the 40
25	percent gross floor area under the Wesley Heights

Overlay. 2 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What is the lot 3 occupancy? MR. GOTTLIEB: I don't know. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: How can you bring an appeal and say that there is an error? 6 MR. GOTTLIEB: I don't know. I have asked -- I have asked the city to provide me with their 8 documentation that it meets with the code. 9 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. This is my --10 I guess this is the root of my concern. Mr. Gottlieb, 11 12 what you're asking for is to step in the shoes of What I understand you saying is that, you know 13 what, you as a citizen have decided that you should 14 review the permit documents for this project and that 15 actually all of the process should halt until you're 16 satisfied that you have done your complete review. 17 18 MR. GOTTLIEB: Sir, there is no process 19 that has been halted and I think if you walk the site as I have and as Ms. Gates has and as Mr. Crews has, 20 you can do an eyeball of the site and see that things 21 look like they are not in compliance. 22 23

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So tell me what is not in compliance.

MR. GOTTLIEB: This is not a frivolous --

NEAL R. GROSS

24

	I'm telling you. The floor area
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What is the
3	MR. GOTTLIEB: the 8 foot side yard
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What is the
5	measurement of the side yard?
6	MR. GOTTLIEB: The lack of a storm water
7	management system.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Listen. This is
9	very specific. Tell me what is the measurement of the
10	side yard. What is your assertion?
11	MR. GOTTLIEB: 4 feet, 4 feet 8 inches, 4
12	feet 9 inches for the garage.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: For the garage?
14	MR. GOTTLIEB: Um-hum.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Oh, dear. Okay.
LJ	
16	What is the side yard at the main structure?
16	
16 17	MR. GOTTLIEB: I believe it's 8 feet, but
16 17 18	MR. GOTTLIEB: I believe it's 8 feet, but I'm not certain.
16 17 18	MR. GOTTLIEB: I believe it's 8 feet, but I'm not certain. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
116 117 118 119	MR. GOTTLIEB: I believe it's 8 feet, but I'm not certain. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. GOTTLIEB: The line does not appear to
116 117 118 119 220	MR. GOTTLIEB: I believe it's 8 feet, but I'm not certain. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. GOTTLIEB: The line does not appear to be
116 117 118 119 220 221	MR. GOTTLIEB: I believe it's 8 feet, but I'm not certain. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. MR. GOTTLIEB: The line does not appear to be CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And the accessory?

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Please, this goes a
2	lot faster. I will listen to your questions.
3	MR. GOTTLIEB: Okay.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And I will answer
5	them. Does the accessory structure have to comply
6	with the side yard requirements?
7	MR. GOTTLIEB: To my understanding, it
8	does, yes.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What else? What are
10	the other errors?
11	MR. GOTTLIEB: The side yard, the property
12	line, both the property owner on the other side and
13	myself and Ms. Gates looked at the property and it
14	appears that the property line as drawn in the
15	diagrams is not accurate.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What is the zoning
17	violation on that?
18	MR. GOTTLIEB: That the side yard setback
19	on the main building is not adequate.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Side yard. So what
21	does the side yard measure with a proper property
22	line?
23	MR. GOTTLIEB: I have not retained a
24	surveyor to do a re-survey of the property.
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. What else?

1	MR. GOTTLIEB: The property does not have
2	a storm water management system. It is transferring
3	untreated water to another jurisdiction, the Federal
4	Government, which is its neighbor, the park which it
5	adjoins.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Big concern.
7	What is the
8	MR. GOTTLIEB: The Environmental Intake
9	Form is
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Wait, wait, wait.
11	What is the section on the regulations in DCMR 11 that
12	the storm water management comes under?
13	MR. GOTTLIEB: I don't have I don't
14	have that in front of me.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. We'll get
16	that.
17	MS. GATES: It's in
17 18	MS. GATES: It's in CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: EISF.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: EISF.
18 19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: EISF. MR. GOTTLIEB: The EIS statement is
18 19 20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: EISF. MR. GOTTLIEB: The EIS statement is incorrect, as is other documentation that is
18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: EISF. MR. GOTTLIEB: The EIS statement is incorrect, as is other documentation that is incorrect.
18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: EISF. MR. GOTTLIEB: The EIS statement is incorrect, as is other documentation that is incorrect. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

1	MR. GOTTLIEB: Well, as I understand it,
2	if these if the environmental forms are not
3	provided accurately, they don't proceed with the
4	zoning approval. It's a prerequisite to that.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What else?
6	MR. GOTTLIEB: The lead hazard control
7	permit is also inaccurate.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Lead hazard control?
9	MR. GOTTLIEB: Yes.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And the
11	zoning attendant to that?
12	MR. GOTTLIEB: It's a requirement for
13	zoning to fill out this form for the Department of
14	Health. They don't proceed without it. You know, I
15	wasn't prepared to argue my case today, so you have me
16	at a disadvantage. I had three of the four parties
17	who agreed to a continuance.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Wouldn't they have
19	mentioned that?
20	MR. GOTTLIEB: And I really thought I was
21	saving the Board their time by trying to settle this
22	thing outside of chambers.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Still, I have no
24	problem with you settling it. Okay. What are the

other assertions? Is that it?

1	MR. GOTTLIEB: That's it, yes, at this
2	time, but when I get the remainder of the response to
3	my FOIA request I might amend my complaint. But these
4	were set forth, I believe, in the original filing that
5	I made with you back on March 17 th .
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: In section 6,
7	section 6?
8	MR. GOTTLIEB: Right.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.
10	MR. GOTTLIEB: They were set forth there.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Let me address that.
12	MR. GOTTLIEB: So this is not
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Let me address that.
14	MR. GOTTLIEB: This is not meant to be a
15	fishing expedition, but it is important to note
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Let me address that
17	then.
18	MR. GOTTLIEB: that the city has a
19	responsibility.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: When one asserts in
21	an appeal
22	MR. GOTTLIEB: These are documents that
23	are supposed to be in the public record and they were
24	not. There is a FOIA requirement that the city is
25	supposed to respond to.

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I understand that.
2	MR. GOTTLIEB: And it hasn't.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And we did the best
4	we could under our power and jurisdiction to deliver
5	those. That is not what is under appeal here, and let
6	me address your section 6. Citing the Zoning
7	Regulations is not what I'm used to seeing as a basis
8	of establishing an appeal.
9	MR. GOTTLIEB: Sir, I had no plans at the
10	time. I have absolutely no documentation, zip,
11	nothing.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And we gave
13	MR. GOTTLIEB: That is an unreasonable
14	demand to make on a citizen of the city, that they
15	document. What am I supposed to do? I had no plans.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I don't disagree
17	with you.
18	MR. GOTTLIEB: There was absolutely no
19	documentation from the city.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I don't disagree
21	with you.
22	MR. GOTTLIEB: That is an unfair burden,
23	sir.
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's fine. It's
25	terribly unfair and we gave you the time and we have

given you the documents, and then we get here today 2 and you say, you know what, I'm not ready to 3 I want to postpone again and I want to go 4 work it out to my satisfaction. 5 Again, I ask you what is our jurisdiction? 6 What is an appeal before us? MR. GOTTLIEB: Ι have asked for 8 continuance. I don't think I have to prove my case so 9 that you can grant a continuance. I have asked for a continuance. The city has asked for a continuance. 10 11 The ANC has asked for a continuance. We're all trying 12 to work this out in a positive way so that you don't have to go through a proceeding and I don't and the 13 developer does not. If you want to insist on a 14 15 proceeding and any appeals that may result from that --16 17 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, I don't. MR. GOTTLIEB: -- it seems just like not 18 19 in the public interest. I don't understand what --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I understand. 20 MR. GOTTLIEB: -- why we're arguing about 21 something that three of the four parties have agreed 22 23 to. 24 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Because, one, we 25 don't -- we don't --

1	MR. GOTTLIEB: And the fourth party hasn't
2	indicated any damage whatsoever. They have been
3	building like gang busters.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But that's not the
5	basis of a postponement.
6	MR. GOTTLIEB: And I should add also, Mr.
7	Chairman, that the ANC had asked last time for a stop
8	order to be issued and that was never issued because
9	there were no plans. Okay?
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Who issues stop
11	were you asking me to issue a Stop Work Order?
12	MR. GOTTLIEB: They asked Mr. Crews to
13	issue a Stop Work Order.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Well, it's not my
15	issue.
16	MR. GOTTLIEB: It was never issued, which
17	is fine, but they have suffered no damage whatsoever.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's not the
19	basis. That's not the basis to continue or postpone a
20	hearing or an appeal, that there is no damage
21	asserted. Yes?
22	MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: Chairman Griffis,
23	first of all to the Board, I apologize for being late
24	and also to Mr. Gottlieb and Ms. Gates. I also
25	apologize to Ms. Gates, the ANC commissioner for 3D,

as well as Mr. Gottlieb and Ms. Brown.

First of all, the Board did grant a continuance for me last time.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Excuse me, I don't -- have you identified yourself?

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Please, state your name.

MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: I'm sorry. My name is Doris Parker-Woolridge. I'm with DCRA, Office of General Counsel.

The Board granted me a continuance last -I believe in July 2006, because I had an emergency,
and I did not oppose Mr. Gottlieb's request for a
continuance for the fact that he did not oppose mine
or he consented to the continuance. And Mr. Gottlieb
is correct. The Agency wasn't able to provide those
documents to him for six whole months. Although we
looked diligently trying to find those documents, we
weren't able to. And without those documents he would
not have been able to prepare for an appeal, in all
fairness to Mr. Gottlieb and Ms. Gates.

So, of course, the Government does not oppose his motion for a continuance. And I understand that Mr. Gottlieb had six weeks from the time that DCRA provided those documents to him --

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.

MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: -- on August the 7th and to the ANC, I believe, on August the 3rd. And I understand the Board is probably looking at that Mr. Gottlieb could have reviewed those documents before this hearing. However, the Government just learned from the Zoning Administrator, unfortunately, that he has been subpoenaed. He was issued a subpoena yesterday to appear in Superior Court at 2:00.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Today?

MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: Today. So the Government also has asked for a continuance. This was not foreseen. He just received the subpoena and the hearing started at 9:00, but it's still continuing on and they told him to be back by 2:00.

And, also, the Government would like to state from reviewing those documents after I received them and meeting with the surveyor as well as Mr. Crews, the Zoning Administrator, Mr. Gottlieb may be correct. There may not be an issue before this Board and, hopefully, that the parties can resolve this matter.

We have done it in the past as well and where the parties come in to withdraw their appeal once they have had an opportunity to meet with the

NEAL R. GROSS

appropriate people that can give Mr. Gottlieb the answers that he is looking for. After I reviewed the documents and met with the surveyor, again, we saw no violations to the side yard, the rear yard, lot occupancy, etcetera. It was in compliance.

However, Mr. Gottlieb had not had the opportunity to meet with the surveyor, as well as meet with the Zoning Administrator, Bill Crews.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: So my point is that the Government does not oppose this, as well as we have to ask for a continuance ourselves.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What is your standard operating procedure if someone had a concern, that you would bring in your surveyor and your documentation and walk the site?

MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: The surveyor is willing to, like I said, meet with Mr. Gottlieb and, also, I don't think Mr. Gottlieb understood that -- there was a question as to whether or not Mr. Crews sends out his inspectors to look at the plan, look at the structure as well as the -- compare the structure to the plans.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I understand that. Okay. Questions?

NEAL R. GROSS

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes, I have a couple quick questions before you leave just to get you on record. First of all, did you not file a motion to dismiss as well or a motion for -- did you not concur with the owner's motion to dismiss?

MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: We -
VICE CHAIR MILLER: So that if there -
MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: I'm sorry.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: I just want to say so that if we are to go forward today and not say, oh, my God, we have to stop our proceedings because you have to go to court, we have you on record as in support of the position. Isn't that correct?

MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: Yes, we're in support of the motion to dismiss and you're asking the same question that Mr. Gottlieb asked me this morning, and I don't know if it's proper or not. However, I would ask the court to defer on making a ruling on that motion to dismiss since if the court is going to grant a continuance, because there may not be a need to even deal with the motion to dismiss if --

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right.

MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: Once Mr. Gottlieb has met with the appropriate parties, it may be resolved anyway.

NEAL R. GROSS

VICE CHAIR MILLER: But my question was if you go and we proceed with the motion to dismiss, I just wanted to get your input now, that your input is what was in that pleading that you filed. And my second question is --

MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: The answer is yes.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you. I'm sorry. I just feel rushed, because I don't want you to be late for court.

MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: Sure.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. I just want to make sure I understand. I know that you have provided documents to Mr. Gottlieb. Is it correct that those documents were sufficient, in your view, or were they sufficient, in your view, for him to then articulate his claims of error in the building permit?

I think they were, because we gave him the set of the plans and we gave him the architect's calculations on the floor area ratio. And so he would have the ability, I think, to review those either by himself or with somebody that had the expertise to do that with him.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Can I ask you in a more broad -- is there anything that you relied on in

NEAL R. GROSS

your review and decisions of issuing the permit that 2 were not provided to Mr. Gottlieb? 3 ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: Not that I'm aware 4 of, no. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, wonder if I could ask one question. 6 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes. 8 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Crews, thank 9 you for being here. Even after your explanations that you want to do to Mr. Gottlieb, do you believe that it 10 is going to significantly change your viewpoint of 11 where we are right now? 12 ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: 13 No, not at all because I'm not contemplating changing my viewpoint. 14 15 I just was contemplating --COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So it's merely the 16 17 courtesy of going --18 ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: Right. 19 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: -- through the calculations and explaining it. 20 21 ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: Right. MR. GOTTLIEB: On the other hand, 22 Crews, you and I spoke earlier and you said if there 23 was an error, you will be the first to admit it and 24 25 fix it.

ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: Oh, right, 2 absolutely. I mean, you know, I'm --And, likewise, I said if 3 MR. GOTTLIEB: 4 there has been no errors and it's legal, then I will 5 simply withdraw my case. So we're willing to work 6 this out and save you the trouble of a hearing. seems to me that that would be in the public interest. 8 MS. BROWN: If I could just make one 9 To the extent that you all decide to reach the merits of this case, we're fully prepared to defend it 10 11 and we have the developer here. Thank you. 12 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. Thank you. At this point, I don't see how utilizing this Board in 13 the manner that is being proposed is in the public 14 15 interest. Follow-up questions? VICE CHAIR MILLER: I don't have any for 16 17 Mr. Crews. I mean, I think he is anxious to go so if we -- I don't know. I mean, I have comments to Mr. 18 19 Gottlieb, you know, about where we are in this proceeding. I don't know if it's appropriate to do 20 that. 21 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Do you have to leave also? 23 PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: 24 MS. Yes, Chairperson 25 Griffis. I have objections for Mr. -- if we're going

1	to continue with this hearing, I have objections for
2	Mr. Crews having to leave, because I need Mr. Crews
3	is my only witness. He is the expert witness. He is
4	the zoning person.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But are you leaving
6	or it's just Mr. Crews?
7	MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: I am not leaving,
8	but I need my expert witness with zoning.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's okay. You
10	can discuss the motion to dismiss, can't you?
11	MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: I would prefer
12	having my witness here with me.
13	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Well
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But the motion is a
15	legal motion.
16	MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: I understand that,
17	but Mr. Crews is very he is the person who has
18	expertise in this technical area of zoning.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Why don't we
20	all go down to the court and watch him?
21	MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: Okay.
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I'm
23	just wondering. I mean, I guess just a general
24	question. I mean, the plans are what they are and
25	that is what the zoning that is how the permit was

1 based upon what they are. If there is something afterwards that is discovered in construction --2 3 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: -- it's not really 5 a zoning issue. 6 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right, no --COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I mean, that is 8 not really our purview. 9 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's right. 10 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Ιf there is something in construction, what we're looking at is 11 12 it's a zoning issue. That permit was based upon plans that were issued and if -- the plans are what they 13 mean, if subsequently there is something 14 different on the site, isn't that -- I don't know if 15 that's in our purview or not. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, you're absolutely correct. Here's what we have. We have a 18 19 motion to postpone at this point and then, depending on the outcome of that, our next step would be the 20 motions to dismiss. Pending the outcome to that would 21 be either going forward with the appeal today or 22 23 whenever.

MR. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chairman, if I could just respond. I alleged defects in the permit that

NEAL R. GROSS

24

was issued based on the plans that I eventually saw. 2 So I'm not alleging after the fact violations. 3 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No. You cited the 4 regulations that might be in error. MR. GOTTLIEB: That's right. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You didn't allege 6 You didn't even state the error. the error. 8 MR. GOTTLIEB: That is correct. In March 9 of 2006 --10 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. 11 MR. GOTTLIEB: -- I did not have the plans. 12 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. 13 MR. GOTTLIEB: They were brought to the 14 15 ANC at the beginning of August. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I know. 16 17 MR. GOTTLIEB: I was out of the country until the end of August and they were transferred to 18 19 me at the end of August from the ANC. Okay? So I have had them for a few weeks, but I would say most of 20 the people that come before you have months to prepare 21 for a case not a few weeks. 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I don't know about 23 24 that, but so what you're saying is you didn't have 25 enough time to look at the documents you got?

1	MR. GOTTLIEB: And I didn't get all the
2	documents. I got documents
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Well, actually, Mr.
4	Crews
5	MR. GOTTLIEB: faxed to me last
6	Thursday.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But Mr. Crews
8	MR. GOTTLIEB: From Mr. Crews' office.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: This is going to be
10	important for you to understand. Mr. Crews has now
11	said under oath that he has given you all the
12	documents to his knowledge that he based his approval
13	of the permit on.
14	There is no other to my mind and I
15	think the Board's mind in our past proceedings, there
16	is no other jurisdictional documents, so don't hold
17	out faith that you're getting more that is going to
18	help your case. You can only prove an error based on
19	what he based his decision on.
20	MR. GOTTLIEB: Well, if there are other
21	documents in the possession of DCRA that he didn't
22	look at
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So you don't agree
24	with me?
25	MR. GOTTLIEB: I think the FOIA request

speaks for itself. 2 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. The city has an obligation 3 MR. GOTTLIEB: 4 to respond to it. 5 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Do you agree with 6 what I said that you have the documents that would be the basis of the appeal? 8 MR. GOTTLIEB: Ιf there are other documents in the DCRA record that he did not look at 9 then, yes, I think I am entitled to use those to show 10 that he made a mistake, absolutely. I don't think 11 12 we're locked into finding out what the intent of the Zoning Administrator is. 13 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. 14 What he did and didn't 15 MR. GOTTLIEB: If it was in the possession and control of DCRA 16 and he didn't look at it because the files were lost 17 then, you know, that's not my problem. That's his if 18 19 it was -- and that's what the FOIA request is getting I want all the documents that DCRA had. 20 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: What of 21 sort documents do you think you would find? 22 MR. GOTTLIEB: Well, there were a number 23 of complaints that have been raised over the last year 24 25 and somebody at the city supposedly responded and

1	investigated them, and there is no record of any of
2	those.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Perhaps it's just a
4	differing understanding of this whole process that
5	we're in, because you're saying that if someone
6	complained to DCRA, Mr. Crews shouldn't have issued a
7	permit because there were complaints on things?
8	MR. GOTTLIEB: No. I want to see what the
9	professionals' response was.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But he is the
11	professional.
12	MR. GOTTLIEB: And he has people who work
13	for him. He doesn't do everything in the office.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, he does
15	actually. You appeal his decision. He is the Zoning
16	Administrator.
17	MR. GOTTLIEB: He is the Zoning
18	Administrator and he is an administrator. He is an
19	office. He has people who work for him.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, no, but legally
21	you're going to be here and I don't care who signed
22	off or actually physically did it. Mr. Crews is
23	MR. GOTTLIEB: And he is responsible for
24	those in his employ.
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's right.

1	MR. GOTTLIEB: And if there are people in
2	his office that filed a report saying this is wrong or
3	that is wrong and he didn't look at it
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But the appealable
5	element is the permit, the appealable element not
6	MR. GOTTLIEB: Yes, the permit.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: It doesn't matter
8	what documents.
9	MR. GOTTLIEB: And the documents that were
10	in the possession of DCRA. I am not going to go
11	inside his head and figure out what he was thinking,
12	what he was reading. That's just that's not a fair
13	way to proceed, what his intent was when he did it.
14	It's what was in the record when he did it.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I don't understand
16	any of that.
17	MR. GOTTLIEB: That's the legal basis for
18	his actions. What was in the file when he granted
19	permission.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, actually it was
21	what was granted. His decision is under appeal.
22	MR. GOTTLIEB: Okay.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Not what's in the
24	file.
25	MR. GOTTLIEB: I have a right to see the

1	file, to see everything that was in there. It's a
2	FOIA request.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Believe me, my
4	jurisdiction doesn't go to all your rights and I'm not
5	saying you don't have the right and I'm not saying you
6	don't have the right to FOIA. I'm saying it has no
7	relevancy here. You should be ready to go today.
8	MR. GOTTLIEB: It has no so a FOIA
9	request to the Government that is not responded to at
10	all, I didn't get one response to this, one letter,
11	okay, you're saying that's
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You're
13	MR. GOTTLIEB: not relevant to your
14	proceeding?
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You're hanging up on
16	a technicality. You were delivered
17	MR. GOTTLIEB: It's not a technicality.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You were delivered
19	all the documents.
20	MR. GOTTLIEB: A FOIA is a technicality?
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You were delivered
22	all the documents that was the basis of his decision.
23	Isn't that what he just said? Do you not agree with
24	that?
25	MR. GOTTLIEB: I don't know what the basis

Τ	of the decision was. I know what the FOIA request
2	asked for and I'm happy to share it with Members, but
3	the city had this is the law. This is not some
4	little irrelevant minutia. This is the law
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I didn't say any of
6	that.
7	MR. GOTTLIEB: that the city has to
8	provide. You said it's irrelevant to the proceeding.
9	It's not irrelevant. That is a law, okay, that the
10	city has to comply with. It's not optional.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Speed limit is not
12	relevant to our hearing today.
13	MR. GOTTLIEB: Okay.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Questions?
15	MR. GOTTLIEB: This is relevant and
16	you're, you know, making fun of it as if it's not.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, I don't think
18	you're
19	MR. GOTTLIEB: Just doesn't you don't
20	comport with any
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I don't think you're
22	hearing anything that is going on here.
23	MR. GOTTLIEB: Okay.
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And I don't
25	understand that.

1	ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: Mr. Chairman, just
2	to double-check on this issue, if we could talk about
3	what materials you have that we gave you. I mean, the
4	reason I ask that is that I have got about three
5	different documents here of calculations and these are
6	what the basis of our decision. And if and I
7	just want to make sure that Mr
8	MR. GOTTLIEB: And I got them last
9	Thursday. Okay?
10	ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: But that's not what
11	my question was.
12	MR. GOTTLIEB: I got them last Thursday.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: But that's his case
14	presentation.
15	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I'm not sure that
17	you should be delivered that necessarily. If you got
18	them ahead of time, that's great.
19	MR. GOTTLIEB: Well, I guess I'm not
20	entitled to any documents, am I?
21	ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: Well, I mean, to a
22	certain extent
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I don't know why you
24	keep
25	ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: Oh, I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: -- being extreme on what I'm saying, Mr. Gottlieb. I am being very direct and I think very succinct, and actually absolutely consistent with every other appeal we have ever done on this Board. And I have just heard the Zoning Administrator say no less than three times that he delivered all the documents that were the basis for his issuing a permit.

The basis of this appeal is an error in the issuance of a permit that has been limitedly and thinly addressed and asserted. However, we have given you the latitude to substantiate that and, yet, you're holding out on that there are these hidden documents that you're waiting for and that you want to get in and figure out all the calculations.

That is all great. I applaud all of that.

I just don't see how that is a basis for me to continue this appeal. That's it, pretty simple. Ms.

Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Crews, what is the significance of those calculations and does he have them?

ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: Apparently. That is what I wanted to check to make sure. Now, obviously, once he had the plans he can make his own

NEAL R. GROSS

calculations, and these that we gave to him last week were an attempt also to help explain to him how we made our calculations and the Chairman is right that this would be our work product and such.

There are no other reports. You know, I personally have been out there a couple of times, but have not prepared any written reports, and I don't know that any of my inspectors have been out there and if they have, they have not produced any written reports, you know, for better or worse I might add because, you know, this issue has come up before.

But the -- so, you know, once he had -- you know, I just want to make sure that I was, you know, making -- was being correct in ascertaining that we have got him all of the relevant documents and to my knowledge, there are no other documents.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. And then because I know you're going to leave --

ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: Yes.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: In your opinion, based on what you have been hearing today, is it possible that some of his complaints may go to enforcement issues with respect to whether or not the building was built in compliance with the permit, as opposed to whether the permit was properly issued?

NEAL R. GROSS

1	ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: Absolutely.
2	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. And, also, we
3	have your pleading. Is there anything else, if we
4	were to go forward and hear arguments on the motions
5	to dismiss, that you would want to add to yours or are
6	you standing on would you stand on your pleading?
7	ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: I would stand on the
8	pleadings.
9	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Thank you.
10	MR. GOTTLIEB: Right. But if I if you
11	make me proceed today, I need him as a witness. Okay?
12	So you're either going to have to violate the
13	subpoena and have him here or you're going to have to
14	give me a continuance.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Well, the
16	MR. GOTTLIEB: I waited from January of
17	this year
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, let me address
19	that.
20	MR. GOTTLIEB: to get the documents in
21	this case.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Let me address it.
23	MR. GOTTLIEB: And you sat by.
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Mr. Gottlieb.
25	MR. GOTTLIEB: I didn't get the documents

for eight months.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: We're not going to have a productive afternoon if you don't let me speak.

MR. GOTTLIEB: I mean, I have had it for a few weeks and you want to push me to withdraw.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No one questions the time. No one questions. You were posing it as a withdraw. I am not pushing you to do anything and I cannot subpoena Mr. Crews. So if you wanted him and he decided in the middle of a hearing to get up and go back to his office, there is nothing that I could compel him to do to stay. Fault me for that, Mr. Gottlieb, but it's not within my powers to make him come as your witness.

Mr. Crews, I think you have to go.

ZONING ADMIN. CREWS: I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I mean, there is an awful lot that is asserted on this Board and actually complained of, of why don't we do certain things and why don't we, you know, force certain things and we have often talked about trying to increase our powers, but we still don't have subpoena powers as the other court has asserted.

Board Members, let's hear it. We have got the steps. I have laid them out here. We have a

NEAL R. GROSS

motion to postpone. Comments?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: I think we ought to hear the motion to dismiss. I don't see any reason to postpone a hearing on the motion to dismiss, which is a legal matter which we don't need Mr. Crews here for and which DCRA has filed a pleading and there is no reason why Mr. Gottlieb shouldn't be able to address whether or not the appeal should be dismissed at this time.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Others?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would concur with Ms. Miller.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Opposing opinions?

MS. GATES: This is the one without the porch.

MR. GOTTLIEB: Right.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I would tend to support that also, and there's two major factors. Let me just try to reiterate it. One, I think we need to go to the substance and the basis of postponement. I don't think -- actually, they are combined and intricately combined.

I think this Board takes very seriously about postponing and continuing cases based on the severity and the seriousness of a lot of the

NEAL R. GROSS

complaints we get on this Board, and maybe we get a lot. Let's just say we get a lot of complaints and some stick and some won't perhaps. But one of the ones that I have great concern with is how long cases take and then how full our schedule is.

I mean, we often talk, I know in private, about creating efficiency and effectiveness, clarity to it, and also in public. And so in any postponement or continuance we have to take that into account, but that is just one element. That is process. Then let's get to the specifics and the substance and that is where we measure it and weigh it, and I haven't heard anything today that supports postponing this.

The weight of additional time for more documents I think has been refuted that there might be a resolution is one thing and I don't dispute that, but that, to me, is not a request or a substantiation for a postponement. That is actually an idea that there is no need for an appeal, and so it should be taken elsewhere. And so I would also concur with the Board and continue into the motions discussion.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. I would like to just separate the postponement issues a little bit. I see no reason to postpone hearing a motion to dismiss, because it's a legal issue and Mr. Gottlieb should be

NEAL R. GROSS

addressing that issue now. I think we might want to revisit, if we don't grant the motion to dismiss, whether or not a witness is needed. You know, that's kind of a --CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's fine. VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- different issue. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Totally different. VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. So at this point then we would be proceeding on the motion to dismiss. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: That's correct. MR. GOTTLIEB: A point of order, As I understand it, I came before you and 13 Chairman. moved for a continuance, so I would like to hear from 14 each of the Members of the Board in their roles as 15 officials of this City of Washington, D.C. as to what 16 their views are on my motion for a continuance. Secondly, it's my understanding that the 18 19 city asked that its motion for a dismissal be deferred to another date after the continuance is granted. 20 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: We have heard all Mr. Gottlieb, your assertion of having each 22 that. Board Member speak --23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: -- what have we just

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

17

21

24

done? Sometimes I don't understand some of the --2 MR. GOTTLIEB: Just like a formal vote on 3 my motion for a continuance. 4 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Oh, when --5 MR. GOTTLIEB: And I would like to add also it's my understanding that --6 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: We'll get there. 8 MR. GOTTLIEB: -- you have granted. 9 parties ask for more time, you have granted more time without spending an hour cross examining the parties, 10 especially when three of the four 11 agree 12 continuance. I got those, the drawings, at the end of August. Okay? I have had a couple of weeks to review 13 it. 14 not an architect. 15 Ι am not a surveyor and I need more than a couple weeks to review 16 I think that is just a courtesy that you have 17 extended to many other applicants. I have seen you 18 19 extend hearings many times and I don't understand why, when the city is agreeing to it, you're not doing so 20 21 here. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes? 22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would 23 move to deny the appellant's motion to postpone the 24

hearing prior to the Board's considering the motion to

dismiss, which has been filed by both DCRA and the
owners. And in support of my motion, I would state
that I haven't heard a good reason for postponing an
argument on this legal issue, and I think well, I
will leave it at that.
I don't think there is prejudice to any of
the parties. I think it's time for the appellant to
at least identify the error, which would be the
subject of this appeal.
BOARD MEMBER ETHERLY: Seconded, Mr.
Chair.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank
you, Mr. Etherly. Others? Speaking to the motion?
Very well. We have a motion before us. It has been
seconded. I would ask for all those in favor to
signify by saying aye.
ALL: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And opposed? Any
abstaining? Very well. Why don't we record the vote,
Ms. Bailey?
MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, the vote is 5-
0-0 to deny the appellant's motion for a continuance.
Mrs. Miller made the motion, Mr. Etherly second, Mr.
Griffis, Mr. Mann and Mr. Turnbull support the motion.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you. Let's

move ahead then. We have motions before us.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Can I just say a few words?

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Sure.

WICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Gottlieb, I just want to say a few words for your benefit mainly, because I think people that don't practice that often before the Board aren't necessarily all that aware of our regulations or the parameters of our jurisdiction.

And I just want to say that I had a little dialogue with Mr. Crews with respect to what kind of errors you might be concerned about, and what we have before us is an appeal of a building permit.

What we don't have is that there was a mistake in the issuance of a building permit that happened at a certain period of time, and what we are looking for you to do is identify the errors that were made in Mr. Crews having issued that permit at that time. If there are issues with respect to how the building was built in compliance with the permit, that is not before us.

And I just wanted to explain that, but I guess at this point, Mr. Chairman, then I guess the procedure would be for the makers of the motion to argue first their motion.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I'm not sure that we need a full argument, but I would rather just have a briefing and then we can hear responses orally on that. I think they are fairly straightforward. It seems to be my understanding of the filing dates that Ms. Brown would be first.

MS. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. We do believe that this application should be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. That is a term of art that is used within the D.C. Superior Court and the D.C. Court of Appeals.

It's a 12(b)(6) motion that says when an applicant or when a petitioner or a complainant has failed to allege any facts to support his claim, and looking at it in a light most favorable to him, you have to get rid of the case if he has nothing to back And I have cited in our brief the up the claims. where someone had <u>Klausen</u> case made vague some manufacturer's allegations about some liquor advertising to minors, yet the person who was bringing the claim could not point to any advertisement.

We have the same situation here. Mr.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Gottlieb has made broad, general, vague allegations that the Zoning Regulations have been violated, but he has not provided one bit of evidence to support it other than what we heard briefly today, that he believes that there is an error in the side yard measurement which we dispute.

But it is up to Mr. Gottlieb to present those facts and show us why he thinks it's only 4 feet 9 inches wide and why an accessory building has those side yard requirements applying to it. That is not our burden. He has the burden. He had the burden to prepare a prehearing statement. He failed to do that. We personally exchanged telephone calls, I did with Mr. Gottlieb, about making sure that he got the full size set of drawings.

He claims that he didn't get them until the end of August. Well, he had them July 21st and I called him several times after that to meet with him to arrange a meeting with our architects to explain it to him and he did not avail himself of any of those opportunities. He has missed the boat. He has missed the opportunity to support his claim and without any substantiated claims, there is nothing to rule on and the case should be dismissed. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you. Mr.

NEAL R. GROSS

Gottlieb?

MR. GOTTLIEB: Yes, sir. The Board seems to feel that the laws that apply in the city, the District of Columbia, don't have any relevance to Board proceedings. So I guess, first of all, I would like to say, as a city resident and as an attorney, it's my understanding that the FOIA law does apply to all agencies of the Government, including this one.

And your insistence that we spend this afternoon, you say you're pressed for time, we are now going to spend all afternoon arguing a case that I could have resolved with the city amicably and that we could have determined whether or not there were violations. But instead of allowing the city and myself and the ANC to determine whether or not the violations I allege are true or not, you have decided all you Members want to spend your afternoon here and argue.

Then you want to give me the opportunity to appeal the case, which I promise you I will. So you, obviously, see your time as unlimited and you also see the public interest as not served by having the city respond to complaints of its citizens and working those complaints and allegations out outside of a litigation setting.

NEAL R. GROSS

It seems to me that the Board is not serving the public interest here, insisting on a hearing when the parties to the proceeding, three of the four, have agreed to try to mediate the dispute. To determine whether the violations are accurate or not seems to me in everyone's interest. And in this case, the developer is moving ahead as he has from the outset.

I might add this case has been fraught with very irregular conduct, very suspicious conduct. The Board is aware that the entire file for this proceeding was missing for, approximately, eight months. I would like to understand how the Board explains that, missing documents for eight months. I am at a disadvantage. I have got to file an action with absolutely no information, no information. That is an unfair burden for you to impose on citizens, okay, and then to make me proceed when I have had those documents for a matter of weeks.

I am not an architect. I am not a surveyor. I am not in the real estate business. I need time to get experts and between Labor Day and now, no, I have not gotten those experts assembled and I have not had the opportunity to. My neighbor who lives right next door to this proceeding could not

NEAL R. GROSS

make the hearing today. She has been very vocal about the development and has had altercations with the developer personally. She was not able to make it today.

Mr. Crews is also not able to make it today. I really am at a loss to understand why you insist on spending your afternoon hearing a proceeding that we are all saying to you might be settled outside, so you don't have to have a proceeding.

Thank you. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good. Of course, we are discussing the motions to dismiss as brought forth by Ms. Brown. But addressing your Mr. Gottlieb, perhaps briefly, comments, it's interesting that -- well, first, let unequivocally we're not holding you up from resolving this outside. You could have done that last week. You can do it next week. That has really nothing to do with us if you think that you can resolve it outside.

How we would -- you put upon us to explain to you why DCRA lost documents is beyond me why you even ask us, because I'm not sure why you would think we would know or actually have any ability to tell you that unless you're asserting this for some other audience, which isn't aware to me. And your

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 an unfair burden on you, I still don't understand and would like to understand. 3 You have brought this appeal. We have 5 gathered here today for you. It is your burden to put on an appeal. We are not adding your burden. We are 6 not being in any way unfair to you in terms of adding 8 additional requirements for you to bring an appeal. 9 It is the same regulations. It is the same burden 10 that everyone has that you have based exceptionally --11 MR. GOTTLIEB: But most people have access 12 to the documents for months before they even have to file the notice of appeal, let alone have a hearing. 13 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You can say it. 14 15 GOTTLIEB: I have had a matter of weeks. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You can say it, but it doesn't make it true. And we take every --18 MR. GOTTLIEB: Look at your calendar and 19 see how long it takes from the day a complaint is 20 filed until the hearing. It's usually six months. 21 had a matter of weeks to prepare for this. 22 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Perhaps the whole 23 process isn't understood then. Okay. 24 That's all I 25 Ms. Gates, motion to dismiss? have on that.

assertions and continued assertions that we're putting

you.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ou.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: I know.

MS. GATES: Mr. Chairman, I really don't know where to go with this to be honest with you. There are irregularities here, but I do believe the irregularities in this building permit application --

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

MS. GATES: -- belong to DCRA and not to zoning.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Let me just--

MS. GATES: So --

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Let me address it specifically. You have a motion before you to dismiss and I'm allowing you to address this motion.

MS. GATES: No, I understand that. I understand that. I suppose I'm torn because I think when Mr. Gottlieb filed, what he filed was based on fact. There were no plans. The house was almost totally framed out. It was clear there was a problem. There was nothing to base a judgment on. The plans have now been found and so I suppose the motion to dismiss should be supported by the ANC and the matter returned to DCRA.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Yes?

MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: In support of the

NEAL R. GROSS

1	District's motion to dismiss, Decker applied for
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Do you want to move
3	the microphone closer to you?
4	MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: Yes.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you.
6	MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: Decker applied for
7	a permit on July 14, 2005. DCRA issued a permit on
8	January 17, 2006. At some point after or after the
9	permit was issued, the ANC and Mr. Gottlieb came to
10	the Agency to review those documents in support of the
11	permit that was issued. The documents were not there.
12	Finally, on August 3, 2006, we found the
13	documents. We notified the ANC and we notified Mr.
14	Gottlieb. Those documents were provided to both the
15	ANC and Mr. Gottlieb.
16	MR. GOTTLIEB: No, you provided them to
17	the ANC.
18	MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: To the ANC and
19	then
20	MR. GOTTLIEB: And then she provided them
21	to me when they came back from review.
22	MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: Yes, and that was
23	for the fact that Mr. Gottlieb said he would get the
24	documents from ANC, so there would be no expense to
25	him to obtain those documents from DCRA to cover the

record. After the documents were submitted to both parties, DCRA did not hear from Mr. Gottlieb nor the ANC.

DCRA contacted the parties to find out if they had any questions or needed any assistance in the documents that were provided to them prior to this hearing, so that we could review the documents and discuss their allegations that they raised in their appeal. Unfortunately, we didn't have an opportunity to meet to review those documents.

However, we reviewed the documents. DCRA reviewed the documents with the Zoning Administrator. We also reviewed the documents with the surveyor and DCRA concurs with Decker's attorney that there were no violations of the Zoning Regulations and that Decker Development is in compliance with the Zoning Regulations.

I could be redundant and repeat what Ms. Brown has just stated, but we're going to say the exact same thing.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well. Thank you. Questions from the Board? Ms. Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Gottlieb, can you identify an error in the building permit that was -- a specific error that is in violation of the Zoning

NEAL R. GROSS

Regulations?

MR. GOTTLIEB: Yes, there are several. First of all, the drawings themselves don't seem to comport with the visual look at the property. Ms. Gates and I surveyed.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Wait, wait. Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. GOTTLIEB: Looked at the property on Saturday. We found the pin in the road, which is a pin that is placed there when the road is paved that shows where the property line is. The pin was very different from the property line shown on this drawing and very different than the property line that they are constructing on now. So there is some reason to believe that these drawings are not accurate and don't comply with reality. Secondly, the setbacks.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: I don't -- it's still not specific enough for me. What do you mean? What regulation is violated by --

MR. GOTTLIEB: The setbacks here are not--don't comply with reality. The drawings say one thing. The lot line as shown by the pin in the road shows something else.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Let's address that just specifically.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Because if we were
3	in a full substantive hearing on that element, what we
4	would then ask you is how would the Zoning
5	Administrator have known where that pin in the road
6	was in order for him
7	MR. GOTTLIEB: Because the Zoning
8	Administrator was called repeatedly by neighbors when
9	they were doing construction before the permit was
10	granted, because this applicant, Mr. Decker, got a
11	permit last summer for a kitchen renovation.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. I understand
13	that.
14	MR. GOTTLIEB: Let me just show you
15	something.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, no, no.
17	MR. GOTTLIEB: I want to show you.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Mr. Gottlieb, have a
19	seat. Let's finish.
20	MR. GOTTLIEB: This is what was done.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Listen, listen to
22	me, Mr. Gottlieb. Have a seat. We're going to focus
23	on one element and then you can't hand those to us.
24	MR. GOTTLIEB: Kitchen renovation.
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You cannot hand

2

those to us. You can put them into the record with Ms. Bailey. Listen, I ask you to do the same thing every other person in front of us does. If you want to put those in the record, hand them to Ms. Bailey. She will go make copies. MR. GOTTLIEB: They are my only copy.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.

MR. GOTTLIEB: And they are printed on the back with a date which shows --

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Then you can't put them into evidence.

MR. GOTTLIEB: -- that the construction was done before.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And we can't talk about them right now if they are not evidence. Let's get back to the pin. What you're asserting is the issuance of the permit. Is it in the regulations that Mr. Crews would go out to the site? Is he required to go out to the site? And let me ask you then if he didn't go out to the site, is that an error in his analysis in issuing the permit? And if he did go out to the site and he missed it, is that the error? I'm trying to understand what that error would be.

I think it's my MR. GOTTLIEB: Okay. understanding. And unfortunately I don't have Barbara

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ingersoll, who is the resident, who met with Mr. Crews
I believe in December, because the construction was
going on without a permit and he did visit the site.
I don't know what their discussion was, but she was
concerned that they were doing construction on her
land. Did you meet with Mr. Crews in December?
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Let me ask
you. Let me ask you outside of the specifics of this
particular case then procedurally, standard operating.
Mr. Crews, the Zoning Administrator, is he availed,
required to go out and check the stake, the property
stakes or
MR. GOTTLIEB: No, but if a property owner
makes the complaint to him and he or persons in his
employ go out and they are told this property line is
not what it is being represented as then, yes, I think
they have a duty to investigate.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And investigate it.
Okay.
MR. GOTTLIEB: And that is actually why I
put a FOIA request in to see what the response was to
Barbara Ingersoll's complaints which were made in
December of 2005 before the permit was issued, this
permit which was issued in January of 2006.

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS:

Ms. Miller,

1	more questions?
2	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I don't know. Was
3	that the answer to my question? I guess that was my
4	only question about if this
5	MR. GOTTLIEB: Well, and as a result the
6	side yard setback is not met.
7	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Which is the side yard
8	setback is not met in what way?
9	MR. GOTTLIEB: It's not 8 feet.
10	VICE CHAIR MILLER: And what is it?
11	MR. GOTTLIEB: It is 4 foot 9 inches and
12	that is the measurement that we have.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Actually, what is
14	the measurement on the permit plans?
15	MR. GOTTLIEB: 8 feet.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And the documents
17	you're referring to that measure 4 foot 9 inches is
18	what?
19	MR. GOTTLIEB: That is the measurement I
20	made and that was the measurement that, presumably,
21	somebody who went to the property in December could
22	have made right then when Ms. Ingersoll called.
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay.
24	MR. GOTTLIEB: But I don't have the record
25	as to

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So I'm
2	MR. GOTTLIEB: First, I don't have Ms.
3	Ingersoll here.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I understand that.
5	MR. GOTTLIEB: Because she is out of town.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I got that, I got
7	that. I'm with you.
8	MR. GOTTLIEB: Secondly, I don't have the
9	report as to what was done in response to her
10	complaint.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Let me just see if I
12	understand what you're telling me. You're saying that
13	the permit documents that Mr. Crews approved show a
14	correct 8 foot side yard. Is that right?
15	MR. GOTTLIEB: Yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. And that
17	you're asserting that there is a neighbor and yourself
18	and others, that in the field condition that 8 feet is
19	not complied with. Is that correct?
20	MR. GOTTLIEB: But more precisely, Mr.
21	Chairman, before the permit was issued they notified
22	Mr. Crews, the Building Administrator
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I understand all
24	that, yes.
25	MR. GOTTLIEB: that there was a

problem. 2 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I understand that, but am I correct in understanding that the documents 3 that were approved for permit show 8 feet dimension? 4 MR. GOTTLIEB: That is correct. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. 6 MR. GOTTLIEB: But he was on notice 8 before --9 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I got all that. MR. GOTTLIEB: -- the permit was issued. 10 11 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I got all that, 12 because here is the frustration. You're a lawyer. You should understand this. I am not a lawyer, so I 13 just get frustrated, but we're bound by these legal 14 aspects. We're bound by what our regulations tell us 15 we can or cannot look at. And if we're asserting an 16 error of the Zoning Administrator in issuing a permit, 17 that basis of documentation is going to be the 18 19 drawings of which he issued. If they don't build it or they build it 20 illegally, that is a whole other aspect. That goes 21 into enforcement. 22 23 MR. GOTTLIEB: I'm not talking

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I know.

something done after the fact.

NEAL R. GROSS

24

1	MR. GOTTLIEB: I'm talking about something
2	that was done before the fact.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I understand that,
4	but I understand there is a lot of complication in the
5	chronology of all this. But even still, and I would
6	wholeheartedly say that the courts will uphold me on
7	this, that the document, the official document, the
8	official decision of the Zoning Administrator, of
9	which is appealable to us do you agree with that,
10	Mr. Gottlieb?
11	MR. GOTTLIEB: I agree that his decision
12	is appealable to you, but I
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: His official
14	decision. What is his official decision in this case?
15	MR. GOTTLIEB: Well, you told me before
16	that you wanted that you were limited
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Just answer my
18	question.
19	MR. GOTTLIEB: by what the Zoning
20	Administrator knew at the time, and I am now telling
21	you he knew at the time that there were issues about
22	the integrity
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I understand.
24	MR. GOTTLIEB: of the drawings.
25	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: We can take these

-	
1	concerns.
2	MR. GOTTLIEB: He was on notice, so now
3	we're going back inside
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, no, no.
5	MR. GOTTLIEB: his head like you wanted
6	to do earlier.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No, I didn't.
8	MR. GOTTLIEB: And I'm telling you
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I didn't.
10	MR. GOTTLIEB: Yes, you said you don't
11	care what's in the record. It's only what he knew.
12	Well, I'm telling you
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No.
14	MR. GOTTLIEB: he was told by Barbara
15	Ingersoll.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: You are wrong. You
17	are patently wrong. Now, listen to me. What is
18	appealed here is an official decision. What documents
19	Mr. Crews' official decision, his field trips or the
20	documents that came out of DCRA?
21	MR. GOTTLIEB: Well, if one of the
22	documents out of DCRA is a report on his field trip by
23	him or other people
24	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Not an official

decision.

MR. GOTTLIEB: -- who responded to Barbara
Ingersoll, that's part of the record.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: His official. Then
maybe it's a misunderstanding on your part, I would
have to assert, because I'm not hearing correctly what
is appealable to us. Letters, little discussions,

memos, emails, those are not an official decision.

MS. GATES: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question, please?

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I guess we're finished with this. Let's move to questions.

MS. GATES: No, this goes right to your question. There is -- I do not have my Zoning Code in front of me, but I know there is a provision in the code that plans presented and plans built should be the same. And I think that in a sense is at the essence of this case today. The plans presented magically disappeared. Permits were issued.

If you look, I assume you all have a copy of this, this is the packet of the building permits that the Zoning Administrator provided to Mr. Gottlieb and to me. No, you don't have it. It is going to take too long really to copy it, but just let me say that as late as January 12th signatures were still being put on this application, so it really hadn't

NEAL R. GROSS

1	been approved.
2	There is a porch on the back of the house
3	that doesn't show up on these plans that we got.
4	There are just irregularities.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I understand that,
6	but what do you want us to do with irregularities?
7	MS. GATES: Well
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Package it for us so
9	we can put it within our jurisdiction.
10	MS. GATES: I am going to try and package
11	it.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I'm going to try to
13	adjudicate it. Whatever you want to do, I'll do it.
14	MS. GATES: I believe it's what I said
15	before. It is an issue that the Zoning Administrator
16	needs to review and any noncompliance issues need to
17	be dealt with.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: So
19	MS. GATES: However, I don't under when
20	an applicant comes to you with something like this,
21	where is the resolution? I mean, why are these cases
22	even taken in, if they don't belong here?
23	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: I'm not sure I
24	understand. Why is
25	MS. GATES: There is a zoning problem

here, because the plans presented and the permit issued are not the same. We saw a permit for a kitchen renovation that was on there for months. There is no application here for a kitchen renovation. But what we did see when the kitchen renovation permit was in the window was a doubling of the size of the house.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right.

MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I'm trying not to interfere too much with these proceedings, but I do have to object. We're way far afield of the motion to dismiss and we're talking about things that aren't even in the record and that is part of the problem. It was the appellant's burden to put any of these documents into the record that they thought would make their case and they are just not here.

MR. GOTTLIEB: Right. Well, because the city didn't respond to my FOIA request. That is why they are not here.

MS. BROWN: I guess the other question then, Mr. Gottlieb, for Mr. Gottlieb is what did you do with the drawings that you received July 21st?

MR. GOTTLIEB: The drawings from July $21^{\rm st}$, with all due respect, I really didn't feel I could rely on given the irregularities in this case. I

NEAL R. GROSS

wanted to see the drawings that came from DCRA. So I
was not going to rely on the drawings that you
provided me, sorry to say, because there have been
many irregularities in this case, as Ms. Gates has
indicated, and I felt I wanted to see the official
record.
I don't think that's an unreasonable thing
to ask for. That is the public's right in any
building construction permit to see the official
record, and that is supposed to be open to the public.
PARTICIPANT: Mr. Gottlieb, I
MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: Chairman?
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes?
MS. PARKER-WOOLRIDGE: Chairperson
Griffis, in reference to the alleged irregularities in
the permit and the plan that Ms. Gates is alluding to,
the BZA does not have jurisdiction over the issue. It
would be the Office of Administrative Hearings where
they should appeal any discrepancies with the building
permit.
VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: We're aware of that,
but thank you for that.
MR. GOTTLIEB: No, the issue is if the
Zoning Administrator is on notice before he issues a

itself, that there are drawings that are not reliable. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. MR. GOTTLIEB: And our point is he should not be issuing a permit when he has reason to believe that the permit is fraudulent. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Right. Believe me, everyone understands your point, Mr. Gottlieb. Okay. Others? Questions, clarifications? Mr. Turnbull? COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I guess I'm looking at giving just maybe some comments. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Um-hum. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: We had Mr. Crews' basic statement earlier under oath that regardless of 14 15 further time that his opinion as to the issuance of the permit would still stand, that he then said that 16 his issuance of the permit is based upon a set of drawings he believes is accurate which, I'm assuming, 18 19 included a certified survey and I think in light of that that if there is something that has happened 20 since then or there is irregularities on the site, that that's not a Mr. Crews' issue. I mean, that's -- I mean, he still based his opinion upon valid documents that he felt were 24 25 valid, I mean, documents that he felt were valid at

permit that there are irregularities in the permit

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

21

22

the time. And as far as a zoning issue and for us, I 2 think that's what we need to look at. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: 3 Agreed. Others 4 quickly? VICE CHAIR MILLER: Quickly what? CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Or not quickly. 6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I don't know. 8 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Comments, questions? 9 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Are we having a deliberation or are we --10 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Could well be. 11 I'm 12 open to my Board in which direction you would like to While you think about that, Mr. Gottlieb, in 13 looking at the documents, the actual permit, stamped 14 documents that were issued, reviewed and issued by Mr. 15 Crews, do you find any of the regulations cited in 16 your section 6 as not being complied with? 17 18 MR. The building permit GOTTLIEB: 19 including the drawings? 20 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: The drawings, yes. MR. GOTTLIEB: Well, I thought -- as I 21 mentioned earlier, the Environmental Intake Form which 22 indicates that the project, according to the contract 23 agreement, is going to cost \$36,000, \$36,300. To me 24

when I see that for an addition to a house in this

area and I see the drawings, that might set off an alarm bell that, gee, maybe this document is not an accurate document.

Likewise, when I see that they are gutting a house that was built in the 1950s and they say there is no lead involved, no lead-based paint involved, I would say that's an issue. When you have an Environmental Impact Statement where the house borders on national park land and it does not respond to the question as to whether any streams within 100 feet of the site are affected and there is a stream on federal park land, that is something I would be concerned about.

The Zoning Administrator, as far as I can tell, absolutely ignored the fact that this property borders national park land and that there will be a direct environmental impact on that park land. There was absolutely nothing done in respect of that and it was absolutely not even considered by the city. And that was one of the things that we had hoped to discuss with the city outside of this proceeding.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Okay. Very well. That's very clear. And, again, I will state that there is nothing that precludes you from doing that with these proceedings. Okay. Anything else?

NEAL R. GROSS

Clarifications from the Board? I'm ready to hear deliberation on this motion. Who would like to proceed?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: I guess I'll start. Basically where I'm at is I think there is a failure here to state a claim of error with respect to the appeal that has been made. The appeal is of -- is with respect to the building permit, that the Zoning Administrator made an error in issuing the building permit. And we have provided the appellant time to articulate what that error is even though he hasn't done it up until now.

Usually, when someone files an appeal they at least articulate what the error is. And we heard the appellant say in July that he needed to look at plans, which are public record, which he should have had the opportunity to look at, and the permit documents in order to formulate his appeal and we gave him that leeway and then we're here a couple of months later and there is still no articulation of a specific error in the building permit and the issuance of it.

I think that the appellant appears to be very disturbed about irregularities that may be apparent with respect to compliance with plans or permits, that it may not have been built as was

NEAL R. GROSS

1 presented in plans. And it's my understanding that 2 is not within our jurisdiction, that we don't 3 jurisdiction with respect to compliance 4 enforcement. 5 don't have jurisdiction, We Ι don't 6 believe, with respect to whether there was some fraud on the part of the owner or some other irregularities. 8 Where we have expertise in is zoning and whether or 9 the building permit may have been improperly 10 issued with respect to our Zoning Regulations, and appellant has yet to be able to articulate that. 11 And I don't believe that it's in the 12 interest or judicial efficiency to 13 public stringing along continuance dates until an appellant 14 15 can figure out even what they want to appeal, so I would be in favor of dismissing this case. 16 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Is that a motion? 17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: If you want me to pose 18 19 a motion at this point, then I would move to grant the motion to dismiss of intervenor, Decker Development 20 Company, and the District of Columbia. 21 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Is there a second? 22 BOARD MEMBER ETHERLY: Second, Mr. Chair. 23 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: 24 Thank you, Mr. 25 Etherly. Again, speak to the motion?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: I just also want to note that as I understood the ANC, that the ANC also supported the motions to dismiss, that the ANC is also concerned about some irregularities with respect to this site, but did not see that the matter was properly before us.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Others?

BOARD MEMBER ETHERLY: Mr. Chair, thank
you very much.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER ETHERLY: I would like to thank Mrs. Miller for her motion. I think she has hit all of the salient points as it relates to where we are in this case. Specificity, specificity, specificity.

That is the word that I have just traced over in my folder in front of me as we have gone through our deliberation which, quite frankly, has been painful, frustrating and very close to, in my opinion, violating some of the strictures of decorum and good order as it relates to how I like to see practice in front of this Board, how I like to see this Board interact with all members of our community, residents, developers, business owners, you name it.

That being said, let me just run through

NEAL R. GROSS

my thoughts here. Specificity. I think Mrs. Miller has been right on point as she has talked about how patient I think this Board has been in trying to set the stage for or I should say setting the stage to facilitate your search for additional information.

As we began this case, there were concerns expressed on the part of the appellant that there wasn't an appropriate level of information in front of the appellant to perhaps achieve the level of specificity that one would desire at the outset of an appeal. I think this Board was very patient in acting deliberately in providing or affording more time.

Documents have now been received both from DCRA and from the intervenor. However, today the Board has been confronted with the request for more time to perhaps better understand those documents, as has been stated by the appellant, more time to perhaps resolve this situation. I want to be very clear and put that particular issue in its proper perspective.

This Board always, I think, encourages those types of opportunities and I share the Chairman's statement wholeheartedly that any action that this Board takes today does not, in my opinion, suggest that those efforts should stop. Those efforts should, please, please, continue. But while those

NEAL R. GROSS

efforts are commendable, I do not think that they release the appellant from the requirements as has been laid out in the intervenor's motion for some minimal level of specificity as it relates to stating a charge.

It is very true that this Board does not have in its own rules and regulations a 12(b)(6) counterpart, if you will, but for those of us who are familiar with the most rudimentary and elementary teachings of law school, many of which come in that first year of civil procedure, 12(b)(6) is a very familiar threshold which any lawyer has to pass the mustard of.

There is no ifs, ands or buts about that.

It's a protection that I think is very fundamental and goes to the heart of any legal proceeding or quasi-legal proceeding for that matter.

And I think the essential struggle here continues to be, and 12(b)(6) at least in the spirit of it as we're talking about it today speaks to even if we look at all of the information in the most favorable light possible, let me emphasize that, the most favorable light possible, afford the appellant the benefit of the doubt, perhaps make a few bridges to buttress some assumptions, I simply still don't see

the specificity.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think, as Mrs. Miller indicated, at best what we have here is a compliance and an enforcement issue. As the Chairman has indicated before, I would love to do a power grab and have all the power at my disposal to remedy these kinds of instances, because we see them quite a bit, but it is not within our purview and it is not my responsibility or the responsibility of my colleagues to correct that deficiency by trying to exercise that power which we do not have.

talked about the issue discussions around resolving this situation amicably, which I hope will still happen, I also want to speak a little bit to the FOIA piece, because I want it to not be lost on the appellant and any of the parties that are here for this case, that this Board takes every aspect of the District's and the laws of this country, be it FOIA or any other relevant provision, don't think that this Board for a minute is demeaning or marginalizing the importance of FOIA and your request, but I think this Board's charge is to look at all of the information that Mr. Crews had at his with that information in hand disposal and ask ourselves the essential question, which is is there a

NEAL R. GROSS

zoning error that was made by the issuance of that permit?

12 (b) (6) Now, aqain as the inquiries suggest, if I look at this in the most favorable light to the appellant and perhaps consider for a moment that maybe that FOIA request is going to result in some new information that perhaps will lead to a zoning inquiry, I still have to balance that against the specificity requirements needed to state a cause of action here on the grounds of this appeal, and I simply could not make that connection. And I think an admirable job was done by the Chair and other Members of this Board to afford that opportunity even up to today.

Again, one of my outstanding concerns, but I want to be very clear that this concern has no grounding in my decision making, but again I think we ran up against some of the absolute limits and boundaries of decorum and good order as this Board afforded the appellant this opportunity to try and build that case of specificity, so much so that I have been sitting here looking at 3108 myself, which is the relevant Zoning Regulation that deals with decorum and good order.

Quite frankly, I felt at times like I was

NEAL R. GROSS

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

being barked at like a junkyard dog and that's not, as a servant of this city, a good feeling to be in regardless of the frustration, regardless of the anger that you may feel. But I want to be very clear that that has no grounding in this decision.

I think the motion is supported by the absence of specificity here. I think that that minimum standard simply cannot be ignored. It is a protection that is there for not only builders, not only developers, but also for residents and property owners, perhaps one day yourself as homeowner.

That being said, Mr. Chair, I think the motion is well-supported by the absence of specificity as laid out in the intervenor's motion, and I am -- I won't say pleased or happy to support the motion, because I'm not, but I think it is the appropriate outcome given this Board's responsibilities and given the requirements and the language and letter of the Zoning Regulations. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank you very much, Mr. Etherly. Others? Mr. Mann?

BOARD MEMBER MANN: I would just add briefly that I also support the motion and just to counter an assertion I actually believe that we adhere quite strictly to the rules and regulations that

NEAL R. GROSS

govern this Board, and I believe that in this case we are enforcing those regulations appropriately.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Thank you. Others?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair, I think

I would agree with the comments of my colleagues, and

I think my basic feeling on this, I will just echo

what I said earlier that Mr. Crews' statement that

although he is more than willing to explain and go

through how they came up with the regulations, how

they arrived at issuing the building permit, that he

is not going to change, that his statement to issue

And then in light of that, I think the efforts to -- his extracurricular work to explain how they arrived at that I think is very commendable and should go on, but my feeling is that we shouldn't endure this any longer.

the building permit would still stand.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank you very much. I think you have all hit on the fact that the burden of bringing an appeal to this Board is very high and we ask that of everyone as it is outlined in the regulations.

It is often not easy when not faced with the day-to-day operations of land use or zoning to assert those, and I think we take an ample amount of

NEAL R. GROSS

time and steps in order to ensure that a quality and substantiveness of appeals can be brought, but we have reached -- in this specific one, I would also support the motion that the fact that the assertion of an error, the official decision of the Zoning Administrator was not cleanly made, and certainly the supportive data or case to base that claim of error is not substantiated.

I want to appreciate everybody's comments on this motion and I think that we spent, as all cases, the amount of time necessary in order to fully understand every perspective that is presented before us and then to move ahead judiciously in the manner that we are charged to do.

That being said, we do have a motion before us. It has been seconded, and I would ask for all those in favor of the motion to signify by saying aye.

ALL: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: And opposed? And any abstaining? Ms. Bailey, if you wouldn't mind recording the vote.

MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, the vote is 5-0-0. The Board granted the motion of Decker Development Company and DCRA to dismiss the appeal.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well. Thank
2	you all very much.
3	MS. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: No further business
5	for the Board this afternoon in this case. Ms.
6	Bailey, is there any other business for the Board?
7	MS. BAILEY: No, Mr. Chairman, that's it.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Very well. Let's
9	adjourn.
10	(Whereupon, the Public Hearing was
11	concluded at 2:48 p.m.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	